

FUNDAMENTAL CHURCH PRINCIPLES

JAMES DOW MORRISON, D.D., LL. D.

937

M83

Columbia University
in the City of New York
Library



GIVEN BY

Dean Hoffmann.

THE PADDOCK LECTURES FOR 1899.

Fundamental Church Principles

BY JAMES DOW MORRISON, D.D., LL. D.,
MISSIONARY BISHOP OF DULUTH.

THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis.

COPYRIGHT BY
THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Contents.

LECTURE I. THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH TOWARDS HOLY SCRIPTURE, -	5
" II. THE CREEDS, - - - - -	41
" III. THE SACRED MINISTRY, - - -	84
" IV. THE INDEPENDENCE OF NATION- AL CHURCHES, - - - - -	135
<hr/>	
APPENDIX, - - - - -	180

238003

I.

The Attitude of the Church Towards Holy Scripture.

"This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached to all the world, for a witness unto all nations." S. Matt. xxiv, 14.

THE Founder of the Paddock Lectureship has indicated the range of the subjects to be treated from year to year.

The lectures are to deal with "such central facts as the Church's divine Order and Sacraments, her Historical Reformation, and her rights and powers as a pure and National Church." Within these limits we will find all the room we care to occupy, while attempting to say something which may be helpful to young men about to enter on the solemn duties of the sacred Ministry.

A great English Bishop of the present century has said that among fundamental principles of our Church, are these: The sufficiency of Holy Scripture, the necessity of believing the

Creeds, which contain the great dogmas of the Catholic church; the Apostolic Ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and the Independence of National Churches. The list is by no means a complete statement of Church principles; but it mentions vital issues which we as loyal sons of the Church are to set forward and maintain, in that field of service to which we have been, or may be, called.

To-night I ask you to observe with me the attitude of the Church towards Holy Scripture.

The Church exists to carry out the Will of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and to fulfil the prophecy; "This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations."

It is natural, therefore, that it should take high ground in speaking to us of that Divine Message which it is commissioned to deliver to the world. It tells us in one of its Articles of Religion (1) that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation;" and in another Article (2) it affirms the Unity of Holy

Scripture; asserting that "the Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament, everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, Who is the only Mediator between God and man," being both God and Man.

The Church, it declares, is a "congregation of faithful men in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinance;" and when it deals with the Authority of the Church it confesses that Holy Scripture is supreme.

The Church may decree Rites and Ceremonies, and has authority in controversies of Faith; but it is powerless to ordain anything contrary to God's Word, or so to expound one portion of Holy Scripture that it may be repugnant to another. The Church is the Witness and the Keeper of God's Word, and it must not only decree nothing against it, but beyond its Divine Mandates must enforce nothing to be believed for necessity of salvation.

The exalted position that the Church accords to the Word of God in its Articles of Religion, finds emphatic expression throughout the Prayer Book. As our Church was very "far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of discipline, doctrine or worship,"

and as its Calendar follows the same rule regarding the use of Holy Scripture, we may safely say that it thoroughly agrees with the words in the preface of the English Prayer Book concerning the Services of the Church. There, we are told, that nothing is ordained to be read in the Services of the Church but the very pure Word of God, or that which is agreeable to the same.

It is asserted that this was the godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers, and it sweeps aside the uncertain stories and legends, the multitude of responds, verses, vain repetitions, commemorations, and synodals that had usurped so much of the space in the Divine Service which belonged to Holy Scripture, and it orders the Curate to warn the people by the tolling of the bell, when service is about to begin, that they may come to hear God's Word, as if this privilege was the most precious portion of our heritage.

In the Ordinal we see the care the Church takes, that its Ministers may be fitted to deliver the Divine message to the people. The priest is warned that he cannot compass the "weighty work pertaining to the salvation of men, but with doctrine and exhortation taken out of Holy Scripture, and with a life agreeable to the same;" and he is commanded to be studious in reading and learning

the Scriptures and in framing his manners after its rule. He is told that by reading and weighing the Scriptures he will wax riper and stronger in his Ministry; and he is required to make public confession that "Holy Scripture contains all doctrine required as necessary to eternal salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ;" and he pledges himself to instruct the people committed to his charge out of the Holy Scripture, and to teach nothing as necessary to eternal salvation but that which he knows may be concluded and proved from the Word of God.

The Bishop at his consecration makes the same vow, and binds himself to expel from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to the Divine Message. Nothing could be more impressive than this testimony from the Ordinal concerning the sufficiency of Holy Scripture.

In the Offices of the Church we will find the same reverence for Holy Scripture. The Prayer for the Church Militant asks that grace be given to all Bishops and other Ministers, that, by their life and doctrine, they may set forth God's true and lively Word, and rightly and duly administer His holy sacraments. Grace also is asked for the people, that with meek heart and due reverence they may hear and receive God's Holy Word. The

hinderer or slanderer of God's Word is warned away from the Altar, and the troubled penitent is told to seek counsel from the Minister of God's Word. The baptized adult is to use all diligence to be rightly instructed in God's Word that he may grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, and live godly, righteously, and soberly in this present world.

God is asked in the Confirmation prayers so to lead His children in the knowledge and obedience of His Word, that they may obtain everlasting life. The Marriage Service, passing by the decrees of secular courts, or the statutes of the kingdoms of this world, or the Canons of Councils however venerable, makes God's Word the supreme standard of what is lawful; the sick and dying are referred to that which is written in Holy Scripture, as the medicine and consolation of the soul; and in the Office for the burial of the dead, the voice of the Word of God is dominant from first to last with its message of comfort, peace, and triumph.

Holding this high doctrine concerning the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, the Church places it first in the Altar Service; and at the very beginning of the Christian year, teaches us to pray that we may so read, mark, learn and inwardly digest

the Divine Message that by "patience and comfort of God's Holy Word we may embrace and ever hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life," which He has given us in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

It is not my intention to defend this fundamental doctrine of our Church. The contention that "the written Books of Holy Scripture, and the unwritten traditions of the Church relating to faith and to morals are to be received and venerated with equal feeling of piety and reverence" our Church strongly denies; while freely allowing the value of tradition as a guide in the interpretation of Scripture. Lectures and courses of study have demonstrated to you the firm ground on which the Church stands in refusing to tradition, however venerable, a place with the Word of God.

Nor will I detain you with any discussion of the so-called Higher Criticism, which has been busily occupied in dissecting portions of the Old Testament, and in striving to ascertain more accurately the probable date and authorship of some of the Sacred Books. Very interesting and instructive have been the labors of students in this field of research; but it is doubtful if the result will be to alter in any appreciable degree the traditional view of the authorship of the Books of the Old

Testament, and certainly it will in no way invalidate the Article of Religion which declares that "the Old Testament is not contrary to the New, but both in the Old and New Testaments everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, Who is the one Mediator between God and man; being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises."

The history of the Criticism of Holy Scripture during the nineteenth century is instructive, as teaching the devout student to maintain an attitude of reserve regarding many of the statements and confident assertions of the critics. During a long period of years the New Testament was assailed by destructive criticism in the supposed interests of truth, and, thirty years ago, in how many quarters did we not hear that the authenticity of a considerable portion of the New Testament could not be successfully maintained? The boldness of the attacks, the positiveness of the assertions and conclusions of the critics, the irreverence of the attitude of many of those professed students of divine truth, tended in a very painful degree to unsettle men's minds, and to strengthen the influences hostile to the Faith of our Redeemer.

And when we consider how groundless and

trivial this criticism really was, and how, after all, it has left the Canon of the New Testament unimpaired to the extent of an iota, while the field is strewn in all directions with the battered wrecks of the theories of the critics, it may well teach us to maintain an attitude of reserve when a school of criticism once more assures us that it has made new discoveries which are final and conclusive.

The Convocation of Canterbury, perhaps the most learned deliberative assembly in the world, when its committees presented the Revised Version of Holy Scripture, received the report and ordered it to lie on the table. I believe it is still lying there. Time is vindicating the wisdom of this procedure, and we may with profit imitate this temperate example, when any of the results of the so-called Higher Criticism are offered for our acceptance.

Scholars may be sure that "they are the people, and that wisdom will die with them," but we do not share their confidence, and we are aware that the last word in the controversy has not been spoken. After the Higher Criticism has been criticised, it seems most probable that it will have made very little alteration in the traditional view of the dates and authorship of any of the Sacred Books.

And here I would like to point out to you another reason for caution.

The temper of the present age is not favorable to sound criticism. It demands something that will startle, and astonish; a new discovery that will upset previous calculations; a new theory which will traverse the convictions of a thousand years; and any conjecture of this nature seems to be welcome, although its proofs be dim and few, if advanced with confident assertion. I presume the rapid advance in the discovery of new material inventions has stimulated this temper, and has increased the desire for something new in every field of research.

But the children of this generation, with all their cleverness, are gifted also with a credulity that I believe will be the wonder of future ages. I do not think that the verdict of the future will be that this has been an age marked by the discovery of great principles, but an age to which has pertained the humbler task of applying, practically, principles already discovered; not an age of genius, but of clever smartness in turning the great theories of other days to useful purposes.

And so the philosophy of this age is apt often to rest on a fallacy, because it is so busily occupied with an infinite number of particulars, that it has

neither time nor patience to reason out the real ground of its principles.

How readily has our age accepted the theory of Evolution and applied it in I know not how many directions! And yet how far it really is from the demonstration that should be possessed, before this wide reaching theory can find acceptance! A great many hints and suggestions which we find in nature have been accepted as if they proved the theory. Many phenomena seem to fit into the hypothesis. But is it anything more than a guess at the unknown? something that may be possibly true, but which has yet to be proved.

And yet the so-called scientific man speaks to us of the Evolution of animal life; from the Monad to the Man, from the unicellular existence to that which Holy Scripture assures us was made in the image of God. Of course, to us Christians it makes no difference at all whether the theory be true or not. Whether God was pleased to transform the dust of the ground in a moment into the form of man, or whether He chose to attain the result through a myriad of gradual transformations is of no consequence; for the essential creation of man came to pass when into this man-like creature the Creator breathed His own immortal Spirit. Then man became a living soul.

The theory of Evolution has no effect whatever on the narrative of the first chapter of the Book Genesis; but as seekers after truth we are bound to ask, What proof has it to commend itself to our acceptance? The proof is meagre, and most defective. Yet how widely is it accepted; the world has adopted it. Yet the world may be utterly wrong.

And I ask you to observe another instance where the scientific world had for ages clung to a theory, which had many hints and suggestions to support it, but which to-day is looked upon as a ridiculous absurdity. I refer to the search for the Philosopher's stone.

For more than one thousand years, the scientific world believed this ridiculous theory, which now excites your scorn; and, as late as this present century, as great a man as Sir Humphrey Davy refused to pronounce it untrue. There were innumerable suggestions in the phenomena of nature to support the contention that metals could be transmuted, and that an elixir of life could be found. But the hard fact remained that the secret had never been discovered. That trifling impediment, however, did not interfere with the confidence of those who taught this doctrine, with the unanimous support of the scientific world.

How like this is to the present theory of evolution, supported by, I know not how many, hints and suggestions in nature; but like the theory of the philosopher's stone, traversed by the disagreeable fact that species is found to be invariable.

One is fascinated by the theory that in the measureless periods of the Geological Ages of the Earth, there was all the time that was needed, to produce the gradual, insensible changes and modifications, that the theory of the evolution of species demands, and we are asked to take for granted that under the law of natural selection, and the principle of the survival of the fittest, the explanation, at last, is offered to us of the origin of species; but while almost ready to give our assent, we naturally ask for a single demonstration, in all the world, of the truth of the theory. Alas, the demonstration is wanting. Like the patient Alchemists of old, the man of science searches for the missing link, in his chain of reasoning, but cannot find it.

When one reads a book like De Candolle's *Origin of Cultivated Plants*, he is reminded, also, that during at least six thousand years, men have been making innumerable experiments, on a dozen species of animals, and two or three dozen

species of plants; the intent being to change and improve the species, and to produce something that will be radically different from the primitive type. He has carried on these experiments in all kinds of climates, in every variety of soil, with resources and advantages immeasurably superior to those which the species could have in millions of years under merely natural conditions; but while he has been able to produce wonderful varieties, the species remains invariable, and the moment it has an opportunity it promptly reverts to the primitive type.

What fame would attend the gardener who could change the rose into another flower, or the apple into a different fruit, or the wheat into a different grain? But the species will not change. It is absolutely invariable. It produces its own kind, or it produces nothing. Just as in the old days, after all the plain reasoning to the contrary, the base metal at the Alchemist's bidding would not turn into gold.

Even as great a man as Hegel, furnishes to us a warning, of the ease with which analogy may be mistaken for identity; and the mistakes of the past are a warning to us to occupy a position of reserve with regard to the unproved hypotheses that clamor so loudly to be accepted as demonstrated facts.

“Prove all things, hold fast to that which is good.” While maintaining a friendly attitude towards every seeker after truth, we are justified in holding to strict account every attempt to change in any degree the traditions of the past.

I have been led to make these observations because it is the habit of the majority of men to take their opinions second hand; and when the advocates of some new thing conjure with great names, when they can say, “every one accepts this, the keenest intellects are in favor of it,” many, and especially the young, are apt to think that this will serve for proof of the theory, or the proposition commended to them for acceptance.

But it may be no proof at all; and when the history of the past furnishes us with so many astonishing illustrations of its fallacy, it warns us that our attitude should be one of reserve until assertion has been supplemented by positive demonstration. And that should be pre-eminently our attitude in our study of the Word of God, by which “thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.”

Assuming that position, nothing need disturb our souls, as we read and teach the Divine Message which God has given us for the salvation of men.

The Church has placed in our hands our

English Bible, and it is our highest duty and privilege to proclaim its truth to men.

The "prayer for the Church Militant" reminds us that it is our first duty. God is asked to give His grace to all Bishops and other ministers, that they may, both by their life and doctrine, set forth His true and living Word, and, next to that, rightly and duly administer His Holy Sacraments. It is one of the marks of the Church of the living God that it is the Witness and Keeper of the Divine Word. If we judge by this token, we will find that this Church of ours has a clear title to the name of the National Church of the English-speaking people.

It is a fact generally unknown, and ignored by those who do know it, that the world owes to our Mother Church, the Church of England, the English Bible; that wonderful Book, which has lifted up our race, and set it in the foremost place among the nations. The English Bible is an ancient book. It has attained its present form, by many adaptations to the vernacular of our race, but its origin is shrouded in mystery. The English Bible, as now read in our Churches, and accepted throughout the world, is the result of a revision made between the years 1604--1611, by more than forty clergymen and laymen of the

Church of England, under the direction of the senior Bishop of our Communion, the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was exclusively the work of the Church. No other religious denomination had anything to do with it.

As you know, this version is accepted and used throughout the English-speaking race, by every religious denomination, with one exception. By whatever name they call themselves—Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, etc.—they look to the Church for their English Bible, and bear testimony that this Church of ours is the Witness and the Keeper of the Word of God.

English-speaking Romanists are the one exception. After their secession from the National Church in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, an attempt was made by them to provide a version of the English Bible. The New Testament was translated and published at Rheims in the year 1582, and the Old Testament at Douai in 1610. It was very unsatisfactory, and many alterations have been made in subsequent editions. The original translation was studiously different from the English Bible in its phraseology; but since that time the Douai Bible has steadily approximated to our version, until now whole paragraphs are practically identical; a strange, although un-

willing, confession, that when the Romanist wants the English Bible he must come to that ancient National Church from which he seceded.

The relative value of the Douai version of the English Bible may be judged from the fact, that nobody ever thought for a moment of adopting it, except the Romanist, and with him, it is a matter of necessity, not of choice.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the numerous attempts to supercede the text of the English Bible. Sometimes the effort has been made, as in the case of the Douai Bible, to produce another and a better version; sometimes the endeavor has been to translate in better form a single book, and time and learning have been used without stint to secure the result.

But the judgment of the world has pronounced every attempt a failure. Our English version, which the Church has given to the world, stands pre-eminent for its accurate representation of the original Hebrew and Greek, and may challenge favorable comparison in this respect with the Septuagint, with the Latin Vulgate, or with any other version. Its language is its own. It is a Biblical tongue, separated widely from the colloquial English of every day use, and from the literary English of other books. It is not the

English of the Elizabethan or Jacobian times, as has sometimes been suggested. It is not the language in common use in any age of our race. It is the voice of the Church, solemn, simple, sublime, proclaiming God's Message to the English-speaking people which He had committed to its care, and the origin of this Biblical English, which has made the English Bible the best written Book in our tongue, is an absolute mystery.

Our English Bible did not originate with the version of 1604, which we now use. It had been in existence, then, for nearly one thousand years. When the present version was prepared the first rule laid down for the translators was, "that they should follow the ordinary Bible read in Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, and alter it as little as the truth of the original would permit." The Bishops' Bible had been made in the year 1568 under the direction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the first rule that Archbishop Parker made for the translators of this version, was, "to follow the common English translation used in the Churches, and not to recede from it, but where it manifestly varieth from the Hebrew or Greek original."

That "common English translation used in the churches," followed by the translators of the

Bishops' Bible, was the "Great Bible" translated and published under the direction of Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1535-1539.

The English Bible we now use is, therefore, simply the Bible of 1535, with some slight verbal alterations. If we examine, we will see that this version of 1535 was framed from an ancient manuscript English Bible. The private ventures of Tyndale and Coverdale do not appear to have influenced the translators of the Great Bible. Cranmer's secretary tells us that the Archbishop took an ancient manuscript English Bible, and divided it into nine or ten parts, causing each part "to be writ at large in a paper book," and then to be sent to the best-learned Bishops, and others, to the intent that they should make a perfect correction thereof. "And the same course, no question, he took with the Old Testament; and when the day came, every man sent to Lambeth, their parts corrected."

The old English manuscript Bibles from which Cranmer's Great Bible was formed have for the most part perished. During the reign of Edward VI. all the ancient libraries were destroyed. The University Library of Oxford, the library of Merton College, that of the Guildhall, London, and those of the dissolved monasteries were carted

off as waste paper to whoever would buy them, and the very shelves and benches of the library of the University were sold for firewood. Manuscript Bibles in Anglo-Saxon and early English, which they probably could not read, would be the first books to perish at the hand of the stupid, malignant vandals that wrought this destruction. But two of the great scholars who lived in the times of Henry VIII. have told us of these old versions of our English Bible.

Cranmer, in his preface to the Great Bible, writes in support of the vernacular Scriptures; "If the matter should be tried by custom, we might also allege custom for the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, and prescribe the more ancient custom. For it is not much above one hundred years ago, since Scripture hath not been accustomed to be read in the vulgar tongue within this realm."

You observe that the Archbishop refers to an ante-vernacular epoch, during which the publishing and reading of certain editions of the English Bible had been prohibited. He says this epoch did not extend much beyond one hundred years. Previous to that epoch the English Bible had always been freely used. The ante-vernacular epoch began A.D. 1408, at a convocation held in

that year in Oxford under Archbishop Arundel. A canon was then passed which decrees and ordains that "from henceforth no unauthorized person shall translate any portion of Holy Scripture into English, or any other language, under any form of book, or treatise, neither shall any such book or version, made either in Wyckliffe's time, or since, be read wholly, or in part, publicly or privately, under penalty of the greater excommunication."

This prohibition was directed, probably, against the versions of the English Bible published by Nicholas de Hereford and John Purvey, 1360-1400, and which are sometimes called Wyckliffe's Bibles. The social and political troubles of Lollardism had called for severe repressive measures on the part of the authorities, and these popular versions which were extensively used by the Lollards, fell under the ban. But the versions of the English Bible, published anterior to the time of Wyckliffe, were freely used.

Lindewood, the learned Canonist, says (A. D. 1430) of the Canon I have quoted above: "Ex hoc quod dicitur 'noviter compositus' apparet quod libros, libellos, vel tractatus in Anglicis vel alioidiomate prius translatos de textu Scripturæ legere non est prohibitum."

You see he assumes that versions of the English Bible, much older than the so-called Wyckliffe's Bibles, were in use among the people, and to this undoubted fact Archbishop Cranmer refers, as within the knowledge of any scholar in his day, for the old libraries had not yet been destroyed. "It is not much above one hundred years ago, since Scripture hath not been accustomed to be read in the vulgar tongue within this realm. And many hundred years before that, it was translated and read in the Saxon's tongue, which at that time was our mother's tongue, whereof there remaineth yet divers copies found lately in old Abbeys of such antique manner of writing and speaking, that few men now be able to read and understand them. And when this language waxed old, and out of common usage, because folk should not lack the fruit of reading, it was again translated into newer language, whereof yet also many copies remain and be daily found."

Foxe says, "Both before and after the Conquest, as well before John Wyckliffe was born, as since, the whole body of Scripture hath been by sundry men translated into our country tongue."

Sir Thomas More writes, "The whole Bible was, long before Wyckliffe's days, by virtuous and well learned men, translated into the English

tongue, and by good and godly people with devotion and soberness well and reverently read." In another place More insists that the clergy never kept the English Bible from the laity, except such translations as had not been approved, and adds; "As for old ones, that were before Wyckliffe's days, they remain lawful and be in some folks' hands. Myself have seen and can show you Bibles fair, and old, which have been known, and seen by the Bishops of the Diocese, and left in laymen's hands and women's, to such as he knew for good and Catholic folk, that used it, with soberness and devotion." Such were the old Bibles in the English tongue which were used in the preparation of the Great Bible in 1535.

A writer who was a contemporary of Wyckliffe speaks (A.D. 1398) of a version of the English Bible of "Northern speech" which seemed to him to be two hundred years old. Blunt says, that we can trace nearly the whole of the Bible back into vernacular translations of the times between A.D. 600 and the Norman conquest. King Alfred, A.D. 850, is said to have expressed the desire that all the free-born youth of the kingdom should be able to read the English Scriptures; which shows how extensively they must have been circulated in his day. We know that a century

earlier Alcuin, at York, was busy translating the Holy Bible into Anglo-Saxon, and evidently his people had the Word of God in a language they could understand, or he never would have said to them, "The reading of Holy Scripture is the knowledge of everlasting blessedness. The man who wishes ever to be with God, should often pray to Him, and he should often read the Holy Scriptures. For when we pray, we speak to God, and when we read the Holy Books, God speaks to us."

We have still the translation of the Psalter made by the Bishop of Sherborne before the year 700; and Bede shows us that the men of Northumbria, gathered around Aidan, at Lindisfarne, as early as A.D. 635 had the Scriptures in their mother tongue.

As far back, then, as the English language can be traced, we find our English Bible. And there seems to have been a vernacular version in the earlier language of the country, when Anglo-Saxon was unknown. For Gildas writes that when British martyrs gave up their lives, for Christianity, during the Diocletian persecution, all the copies of the Scriptures, that could be found, were burned in the streets.

Thus may we judge the attitude of our Church towards Holy Scripture. Planted in the

home of our English-speaking race in apostolic days, by apostolic men, possibly by the great apostle of the Gentiles himself, it has been faithful to the command to keep, and bear witness to the Word of God. It has striven always to give, to the people, God's Word in the language which they understood. And so it has given to our race the English Bible. The origin, and the secret, of the composition of this Book no man can tell; it is best stated, when we say, the Church has given it to the race; for no man, and no generation of men, can claim authorship of the English Bible. Beyond question, as a literary triumph, it is the best written book in the English tongue, and it is almost the only successful translation in the world.

For, as we well know, the charm, and power, of a book, seems to depart, when we turn it into another language. To read Shakspeare a man must learn English, to read Homer he must know Greek. No translation can convey the message to us. It seems like a dead thing. But there is one exception to the rule, that translations are failures. It is the English Bible. It speaks to men, with the fervor, the pathos, the power of the Living Voice. And how is this? I know of no adequate explanation of the wonder but this: God has given to His Church, the gift of tongues, the power to

convey His Message, as a living voice to men ; and to His Church, when it faithfully strives to do His Will, He continues the wonderful Gift. And so this Church has the power to give the Word of God to the race entrusted to it, with the grace, and power of the living voice. Hence the wonderful power of the English Bible. God who spake by the prophets, speaks still by His Church, and bestows on it the power to convey His Message to the souls of men.

None can adequately appreciate the blessing which our Church has bestowed on the English-speaking race. It found our forefathers savages whose idea of war was extermination, men so brutal, that neither age, nor sex was spared in their fury, so degraded, that they bartered their fair-haired daughters to the Moors. And it has lifted up our race until it stands in the front of all the Nations of the earth, not only in power, but in righteousness, in fair dealing between man and man, in its reverence for law, in its guardianship of human freedom, in its hatred of oppression, of wrong doing, of crime. In that long, toilsome, upward march of the race, the Church has been the teacher and the leader.

It was the Church, headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, that was foremost in securing

Magna Charta, which Hallam calls the key stone of English liberty, and of which he says: "If every subsequent law was swept away, there would still remain the bold features that distinguish a free from a despotic monarchy."

"Two great men," he adds, "may be considered as entitled, beyond the rest, to the glory of this monument—Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, and William Earl, of Pembroke. To their temperate zeal England is indebted for the two greatest blessings a patriotic statesman could confer; the establishment of civil liberty, on an immovable basis, and the preservation of National Independence."

It is, to that ancient source, that we go back, for the principles enshrined in our own Declaration of Independence, and wherever, in the world, to-day, you find a community of English-speaking men, there you will find the principles of Magna Charta, which the Church in the dark days of old, won for the race. In the uplifting of our race, the Church has been the blessed, and efficacious instrument.

And if we ask the means which it has employed, to bring about this result, I answer, that it has been the faithfulness of the Church in reading, in teaching, in publishing the English Bible. The

sword of the Spirit is the Word of God. We can see, with what unwearied faithfulness, the Church has given the Word of God, to the English-speaking race, in a language they could understand. And if the Service of God is perfect freedom, and if the throne of law is the Bosom of God; need we any better explanation, of that passion for personal freedom, and that reverence for Constitutional law, which are so characteristic of our race, than the fact, that age after age, from the cradle to the grave, the Church has faithfully taught us the Word of God?

As a rule, the English-speaking race is profoundly ignorant of the debt it owes to the Church. How many among them know, that it is the Episcopal Church from which they have received the English Bible? Indeed, how many of our own people seem to be aware of the fact? Truth may be very close to a man and yet he may be utterly ignorant of it.

I remember, one day, when a good man, of a certain Christian denomination was speaking to me, and unconsciously showed his scorn of the Church, how amazed he was when I asked him to turn to the table of contents of his hymn-book, and note the authorship of the hymns. Out of 335 names, 165 were those of writers of the Epis-

copal Church. Here was a man, who knew not that he owed anything to the Church, who pitied it for its want, as he thought, of spiritual life; and yet, whenever he wished to lift up his heart in praise to God, to that Church rather than to his own denomination, or to all others, combined, he instinctively turned, to supply him with fitting expressions of praise, and prayer, and thanksgiving. You may think, then, how great was his astonishment, when he found that to that Church, also, he owed his much loved, well read English Bible.

The claim, that this Church, by the common consent of all men, is the Steward of the Word of God to the English-speaking race is one that we have the right to proclaim. Not without pains, and toil, has this Church, in the past, set forth the English Bible, before the world. The sons of the Church, have dared, and suffered all things to fulfil this duty.

I have stood in the street of Oxford at the Martyrs' Memorial, where, in the dark days, when strenuous effort was being made to destroy the power of the Church to teach the English Bible, two of our Bishops laid down their lives for a testimony, and the one cheered the other, as they went to the stake, saying, "Be of good cheer,

brother; we shall, to-day, light a candle in England, which shall never be put out."

True prophecy of a loyal heart! how abundantly it has been proved! It is going on four centuries since then, and the light of that English Bible, for which they died, shines not only in England, but over all the earth, wherever that dominant race has made its home.

To us, in God's Providence, there has come the high calling of God, to take that lamp of truth from the faithful hands of a past generation, to hold it high before the world, and hand it on, to those who shall follow us, undimmed by faithlessness, or cowardice, or indolence.

We are ministers of God's Word. It is our Message to a sinful, needy world.

We cannot magnify too greatly the grandeur of our Commission. For this Divine Word entrusted to us, is the Power of God unto Salvation to every one that believeth. So important does the Church consider this duty, so necessary an adequate and constant preparation for it, that it pledges us, at our ordination, to make the Word of God the great study of our whole life time. "Will you be diligent in prayers, and in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to a knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of

the world and the flesh?" And we solemnly reply, "I will endeavor myself so to do, the Lord being my helper."

Using our Prayer Book as our commentary, and guide, we must study our Bible until its page shall be an open book, to our mind, and from an intellect saturated with the inspired Message, we can deliver it to the world. Our sermons and instructions should reflect our study of Holy Scripture, in their aptness to draw from its exhaustless stores, the arrows of truth to pierce the sinful conscience; and the doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness which are the marks of the man of God, thoroughly furnished, unto all good works.

Often one hears very harsh criticisms of sermons, and probably a good deal of it is well deserved. If the aim of the sermon is to magnify oneself, or if it is of such a character, that it cannot be regarded as the Divine Message which the Blessed Redeemer has commissioned us, His ordained servants, to deliver to men, none can brand its unworthiness too harshly. But, if in obedience to our ordination vow, we seek in our sermons, out of Scripture, to instruct the people committed to our charge, we are fulfilling, whatever men may say of us, one of the highest of our duties. The

truly valuable preacher is the man who thoroughly believes, and accurately knows the English Bible.

Mr. Baring Gould in his book, "Post Mediæval Preachers," discusses the religious movement which checked and overwhelmed the Huguenot party in France, and he attributes the success attained to the preaching of the Romanist clergy. Sacred eloquence, he says, is the most powerful engine known for influencing multitudes; and the Catholic clergy resolutely cultivated it, and used it with as much success as Chrysostom, Gregory, or Augustine.

He goes on to tell how diligently they drew on the patristic stores of theology and the exhaustive commentaries on every word of Scripture which great scholars of former ages had prepared. And he remarks that the main contrast between Roman Catholic sermons and those of Protestant divines in that age consists in the wonderful familiarity with Scripture, exhibited by the former, and the scanty use made of it, by the latter. It was not, he tells us, that these Romanist preachers affected the quoting of texts, but they seemed to think, and speak in the words of Scripture, without an effort, and their Scriptural illustrations are not confined to one or two books, but evenly selected from the whole Bible.

Here, then, we have the secret of effective preaching. And, as I have pointed out, it is the method which the Church commands us all to follow. It pledges us to be accurate and diligent students of the Bible, and out of these Scriptures to instruct our people. But the command is sadly neglected, and to this neglect we may rightly attribute the feebleness of the pulpit.

I ask you never to rest satisfied until, as the result of study, the whole range of the Word of God is within the grasp of your mind, so that you could give at any time, in your own words, a comprehensive analysis of any Book of the Bible; or, so that you could draw at will, from any portion of it, the weapons you require in your warfare with evil. I have said that your Prayer Book is your commentary. You will find that it draws impartially from every portion of the Word of God, and by following it closely in your study of the Bible, you will be saved from the one-sidedness which has prevented so many good men from prophesying according to the proportion of the Faith.

May I also add, that in delivering the Word of God in the services of the Church, we ought to be sure that we are able to read it. The complaint is often made that clergymen read the Service and

the Lessons from Holy Scripture in a manner that does not conduce to edification. Too frequently it is an accurate criticism, but is it not a crime, and a shame that any clergyman should be justly liable to this censure?

In your preparation for the Sacred Ministry, you must at any pains secure such training, that when you read the Word of God in the congregation, it shall be with such reverent distinctness and intelligence that your solemn message will be clearly conveyed to every one among your hearers.

Once, a person said to me, of a clergyman, "I love to hear him read the Lessons. He reads them as if the Bible was the most solemn and wonderful thing in the world." It was a strange but accurate criticism of one of the best readers in the ranks of the clergy. Remember, then, that people will expect that you will be able to read the Bible. Do not, by inattention to lessons in elocution, come unprepared to the work of the Ministry.

Lastly, my brethren, remember that if you are to be faithful ministers of the Word of God, your personal character must reflect the Divine Word, as the mirror reflects the face. Our character, and our conversation should be an epistle known and read of all men.

When you enter on your ministry you will often be watched by unfriendly eyes. But if you

are diligent to frame your life according to the Doctrine of Christ, men will take knowledge of you, that you have been with Jesus. They will see that you live as you pray; when before the Altar you ask for God's grace that both in your life and doctrine you may set forth His true and living Word.

II.

The Creeds.

“The Faith which was once delivered unto the Saints.” Jude 3.

BELIEF in the Creeds, as containing the great dogmas of the Catholic Church, is a fundamental principle of our Communion. The Athanasian Creed opens with the declaration: “Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith,” and as the preface of the Prayer Book solemnly insists, “that this Church is very far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline or worship,” we may assume, that the preface of the Athanasian Creed accurately represents the Mind of the Church concerning the Creeds.

In the Eighth Article of Religion, the same truth is put in another form:

“The Nicene Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles’ Creed, ought thoroughly to be received, and believed; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.” The last clause makes the Article consistent with that other fundamental principle, that “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite, or necessary to salvation.”

The Church in its care for the souls of men, closely follows the principle, that to believe God’s Word, is to believe the Creed, and that faith in the Creed is necessary to Salvation.

In Holy Baptism, when about to receive into the Church those who have been conceived and born in sin, and who must be regenerate and born anew of water, and the Holy Ghost, if they would enter into the Kingdom of God, it makes belief in God’s Holy Word, that is to say belief in the Creed, an absolute pre-requisite, before administering the Sacrament. The baptized is warned either personally, or if an infant, by his sureties, that he must faithfully promise that he will constantly *believe God’s Holy Word*, and therefore is re-

quired to answer the question, "Dost thou believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed?"

In the closing exhortation, provision is expressly made, that the child shall be taught the Creed, as part of his "solemn vow, promise, and profession." In the Catechism he is taught, that part of his bounden duty is to believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith, and heartily to thank his Heavenly Father who has brought him to this state of Salvation; and to pray that by His grace he may continue in the same, to his life's end. In Confirmation, before God and the congregation, he vows to believe the Faith of Baptism.

And the Faith which the Church so carefully teaches its children they are never permitted to forget. The Confession of this Faith is made a duty in every act of worship, and the plain command is given: "Then shall be said the Apostles' Creed by the minister and people, standing." At the Sacrament of the Altar, the Creed is to be confessed after the Gospel, and on certain days of the year, the confession must be made in the more exact terminology of the Nicene Symbol.

And when in God's Providence we are laid on the bed of sickness, the Church sends to us its message by the hand of its minister, and part of his

discipline, and medicine for our soul, is the solemn confession of our faith, under circumstances of the most affecting nature.

“Forasmuch as after this life there is an account to be given unto the Righteous Judge, by whom all must be judged without respect of persons, I require you to examine yourself, and your estate, both toward God and man, so that accusing and condemning yourself for your own fault, you may find mercy at our Heavenly Father’s hand for Christ’s sake, and not be accursed and condemned in that fearful judgment. Therefore I shall rehearse to you the Articles of our Faith, that you may know whether you do believe, as a Christian man should, or no.” And after the recitation of the Creed, the sick person confesses, “All this I steadfastly believe.”

Thus, from the cradle to the grave, does the Church seek, that the petition of the thanksgiving of the baptismal service may be fulfilled, “Increase this knowledge, and confirm this faith in us evermore.” We are taught to pray, that we may depart this life in the confidence of a certain faith; and at the grave we give God thanks for all His servants who have finished their course in faith, and beg that we may have our portion in the

blessed company of them who are departed in the true faith of God's Holy Name.

Thus does the Church bear its unequivocal testimony to the preface of the Athanasian Creed: "Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith."

We may say of the Creeds what the Church says of the Holy Sacraments, that they are means of grace. We must never lose sight of the end while thinking of the means. The Church of the Living God; the Holy Scripture, the Creeds, the Sacraments, are means employed by the Son of God to attain a certain result.

When He ascended upon high He gave gifts to men, apostles, evangelists, prophets, pastors, and teachers, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man; unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

This is the end to be achieved; the formation of a royal generation, in the likeness of the great King, whom He will not be ashamed to call His brethren. The preaching of the Gospel is intended to make men like our Blessed Master, and that preaching is successful in proportion as it

forms the reflection of Christ's image, in the character and habits of those who hear it.

In its essence, Christianity consists of the Life, the Character and the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. It delineates the true relations of man to his God, and to his fellow man, and displays a Life in which those relations were perfectly realized. This blessed Life is set before us for imitation. The Saviour Himself calls to us to follow Him. Necessarily with the delineation of the Saviour's life, there followed some explanation of the Nature of His Being; and so, along with the picture of His pure and holy life, instructions were added, concerning His relations to the Eternal Father and to the sons of men.

This teaching was plain, and simple, and adapted by the resources of infinite wisdom to the feeble faculties of man, yet necessarily it dealt with the most profound mysteries in the universe, and hence arose the main difficulties of the early ages of Christianity. The human mind found in the gospel message the deep things of God, which at one moment fascinated and baffled the human intellect, as it vainly strove with its fitful speculations to measure the Infinite with the handbreadths of human understanding.

Hence arose the innumerable heresies that troubled the souls of men in the early ages of Christianity. And during the first five centuries, the Church was compelled to face the burning questions of the hour, and to state the principal doctrines of the Christian Faith in distinct, dogmatic form. The false, or inadequate, statement of the heretical teacher, had to be met by a clear and true statement of the mysteries of the Faith. The work was necessary, inevitable, although it was not congenial to the Christian temper; nor destitute of danger to the spiritual life of the Church.

The Creed of the Church has ever been the same, although not expressed at first with that exactness which heresy compelled the Church presently to employ. The philosophical gnostics compelled Churchmen to revise their position, and to state with accuracy the mind of the Church on the Articles of the Faith. The struggle with error might be protracted, but the victory of the truth was never doubtful; and at length the completed Nicene symbol declared against every adversary the verities of the Catholic Faith.

We know it has been asserted that as time went on the Church greatly modified the Faith; that the earliest form of the Creed contained ar-

ticles of belief in excess of the Apostolic teaching, and that interpretations were put on the primitive faith by later generations of Christians that did not exist in the early ages of the Church's history.

The local Creed of the early Christians at Rome is at least as old as the middle of the second century. From that primitive document the Apostles' Creed has been gradually evolved; other churches, feeling themselves under no obligation to adhere to the letter of the Roman Creed, and modifying, and adding to its clauses, some of these additions being as late as the seventh century. But none of those additions modified in any degree the Faith once delivered to the Saints, or can be regarded as a departure from primitive belief.

It has been asserted that the Trinity of the second century was essentially unequal; that it included a Father, whose paternal relation was that of the Creator of Nature; a Son whose filial relation began with His human life; and an impersonal Spirit, the Energy of the Father, and of the Son.

But in reality these false conceptions were creations of the third and fourth centuries, which were denounced by the Catholic Church as soon as their nature was clearly seen. The theology of the Church is indebted to Christian teachers of the

fourth century for much of its philosophical form and literary dress, but its substance has always been the teaching of the Lord Jesus and His Apostles, jealously preserved, and gradually assimilated by successive generations of the Faithful.

The Fatherhood of God expressed in the Creed was not a mere fatherly relation to Nature, but a special relation to Jesus Christ, and the members of His Church. Clement speaks of Him as "our loving and compassionate Father (ad Cor. C. 29). Ignatius dwells almost exclusively on the relation of the Divine Father to our Lord (ad Magn. 1. 3. 7. 8.); and the Epistle to Diognetus is emphatic in its statement of the mission of the only Son of God. "As a King sends His Son, who is also a King, so sent He Him, as God He sent Him (the word "God" is in the accusative, and refers to the person sent) (*ὡς θεὸν ἐπέμψεν*); as to men He sent Him, as a Saviour He sent Him (Ep. ad Diog. C. 7). Justin Martyr says that Jesus is "the Word of God, born of God in a peculiar manner, differing from ordinary generation."

Expressions like these from Christian writers of the period anterior to the date when the Creed is supposed to have been formulated, sufficiently attest the belief in the Divine Fatherhood, as spe-

cially relating to Jesus Christ and the members of His Church. Nor is it true that, when the Creed was formulated in the middle of the second century, Christians had not begun to claim for Jesus Christ a Sonship anterior to His human life.

Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, comments on the twenty-second Psalm as relating the suffering and death of Christ, and goes on to say: "I have already proved that He was the Only-begotten of the Father, of all things, being begotten in a peculiar manner Word and Power by Him, and having afterwards become man, through the Virgin." Aristides, writing his apology some twenty-five years earlier, says that "Christians trace their origin to Jesus Christ, and He is acknowledged by the Holy Spirit to be the Son of the Most High God, who came down from heaven for the salvation of men."

Lightfoot has shown that Ignatius held substantially the same views as the Nicene Fathers concerning the Person of Christ. One quotation must suffice, but that is sufficient for our purpose.

"We have a physician, the Lord our God, Jesus the Christ the only begotten Son and Word before time began, but who afterwards became Man through the Virgin"(Ep ad Eph. C. 7).

The early Christian writers were not profound theologians, and the Divine generation, involved in the fact of the Divine Sonship, may not have been clear in their minds, but it is plain they believed in the "Only-begotten Son before time began," who afterwards took our nature upon Him.

It has also been asserted that the Christians of the second century regarded the Holy Ghost, not as a Person, but as a Gift, or Power. "No proof," says one writer, "can be shown that about the middle of the second century the Holy Ghost was believed in, as a Person." The terminology of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was by no means fixed and uniform, even in the fourth century; and when we interrogate writers of the age following the Apostles, all we expect to find, is consciousness of a distinction between the Father and the Spirit, like that between the Father and the Son.

And does not Clement, writing fifty years before the middle of the second century, betray the consciousness of this declaration when he says, "Have we not one Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ, and one Spirit of Grace" (Ep ad Cor. C. 46), or when he exclaims "As God lives, and the Lord Jesus Christ lives, and the Holy Spirit" (Ad Cor. C. 58). (Vid. Lightfoot, *Ap. Fathers*, Pt. I.,

ii, 169)? Had not the Personality of the Spirit been part of the Christian doctrine for a long period when the Christians of Lyons, A.D. 177, said of one of their martyred brethren, "He was called the Christian's advocate, and he had the Advocate (Παράκλητος) in himself"?

When the heresy of Praxeas arises a little later, and calls for an accurate expression of the Faith that the Christians had always held regarding the Holy Spirit, Tertullian instantly asserts that "the Father is one, the Son is one, and the Spirit is one, and that they are distinct from Each Other." It was no new doctrine, but the same Faith which Clement had held a century earlier, only restated, against a new heresy, in sharp and decisive terms.

It has also been asserted that the Virgin birth of our Saviour, did not have a place in the earliest Gospel preaching, although it became a tradition among Christians at an early date. There is no question about the early date of the tradition. Justin Martyr asserts again and again that our Lord was born of a Virgin, and denounces "those of our race" (the Ebionites) for asserting that He is "a man born of men."

The Apology of Aristides was presented to the Emperor Hadrian at Athens, A.D. 125. In it

we read: "The Christians trace their origin from the Lord Jesus Christ, and He is acknowledged by the Holy Spirit to be the Son of the Most High God, who came down from heaven for the salvation of men, and being born of a pure virgin, unbegotten and immaculate, He assumed flesh, and revealed Himself among men" (C. 15).

Ignatius says: "Jesus Christ was, according to the appointment of God, conceived in the womb of Mary, of the seed of David, but by the Holy Ghost." "Now the virginity of Mary was hidden from the prince of this world" (Ad Eph. C 18. 19.). The heretics against whom he wrote did not deny the fact, but explained it away as they explained away our Lord's Passion. It would have been a controversial advantage to Ignatius, if he could have asserted that our Lord was born as other men are; but he knew nothing of any such doctrine, and the Churches of Western Asia Minor to which he wrote, were evidently involved in the same ignorance.

Even the Jews, in their bitter persecution of the Christians, made no serious attempt to show that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary. Their libel was, that He was the son of a Roman soldier named Pantheras; and they called Him, "Ben Pandera," an evidently intentional misreading of

the name in vogue among the early Christians: "Ben Parthena," the Virgin's son.

When Ignatius wrote, the Virgin birth was already accepted without question, from Antioch to Ephesus; in the Churches which had received the Faith from St. Paul, and which were fresh from the teaching of St. John.

At the election of Matthias, St. Peter stated his understanding of the duty laid upon him and his fellow Apostles. They were to bear witness of the things they had seen and heard since the Baptism of John (Acts I. 21. 22). They confined themselves to their personal testimony, that they might be able to say, "We are witness of these things."

St. Mark's Gospel is said to be the substance of the preaching of Peter, and it begins with the baptism of John. It does not relate the circumstances of the Childhood of our Lord, for Peter was not a witness of that portion of our Lord's Life. St. John passes at once to the events of the Saviour's Ministry with the single sentence, "The Word was made Flesh." But to suppose that these Evangelists were ignorant of the facts relating to our Lord's Childhood, because they confined their narratives to the events of His Ministry which they witnessed, is absurd. Christians of

the Apostolic age, St. Luke tells us, were carefully instructed in the events of our Lord's Childhood; and he and St. Matthew have given us independent narratives of the facts relating to the Saviour's birth.

St. Matthew relates the story of Joseph, and, no doubt, gives us the tradition which had been handed down from him at his home in Galilee. The narrative of St. Luke comes from the Mother of our Lord, a tradition which, with the hymns of Zacharias, and Symeon, would naturally be treasured in the Church of Jerusalem, where Mary found a home, and which for many years was presided over by James, the brother of the Lord.

We are reminded that St. Paul does not mention the Virgin birth, in his epistles, but he is equally silent on many other matters which formed part of the Apostolic teaching. The purpose of his epistles was not to restate the historic basis of the Christian Faith, but to teach the religion and ethics of the Creed.

We may know what the substance of his teaching was, however, from the gospel written by his pupil and friend, St. Luke; and we can see how prominent the Virgin birth was in his mind when he insists on the sinlessness of the Saviour, designates Him "the Man from heaven," and speaks of

Him as "made of a woman," when he would naturally have called Him the Son of Joseph if any such belief had ever influenced him.

In one place, St. Paul speaks of the Saviour as of the seed of David, but so also does Ignatius, in the same sentence in which he declares the Virginity of the Saviour's Mother.

There is no evidence whatever that either St. Paul, or any other apostolic writer, had any doubt whatever regarding the Virgin birth of Jesus. It was reserved for Jewish blasphemers and Corinthian and Ebionite heretics to invent the libel in their vain endeavor to deprave and destroy the Faith of the Catholic Church. It was a long and bitter struggle that the Church had to wage with the enemies of the truth, but the victory was never doubtful. The Faith, once delivered to the Saints, was loyally preserved and handed on; and at length the completed Nicene symbol declared against every adversary, the verities of the Creed. But the victory of truth had its dangers. In the stress of conflict, when earnestly contending for the Faith, men seemed to forget that it was a means for the purpose of securing a certain end.

The Creed must be translated into a life, or it has failed its purpose. It is intended to be the mainspring and motive of action, and the index of

character, or it is not our Creed; for a man must, in the nature of things, live his real belief. Therefore St. James brings this test to a man's creed: "I will show thee my faith by my works," "for as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

The purpose of the Creed was the perfecting of the saints; the formation of a generation of Christ-like men, "till we all come in the unity of the Faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." This fact was obscured while men were earnestly contending for the Faith. Having thrown all their energy into one special branch of spiritual activity, they were tempted to exaggerate its importance, and to lose their interest in other pursuits. It is always the danger of the specialist. The penalty of his keen perception in his own department, is a bat-like blindness, whenever he looks in any other direction.

And so the utter absorption in theological speculation to which circumstances condemned many of the keenest minds in the Eastern Church, had the effect of obscuring the true relations between doctrine and life. Antioch might loyally contend against those who denied our Lord's

Humanity, it might be so thoroughly redeemed from paganism, that when Julian, the apostate, restored the temple of Daphne on the ruins of the church of St. Babylas, and visited his gorgeous temple, expecting a splendid ceremonial, and a great throng of worshippers, he found, to his astonishment, and dismay, only one individual, a poor old heathen priest, with no better sacrifice than a goose, which the officiating minister had provided at his own cost. Antioch was a Christian city. There were no heathen left. And Antioch was intensely orthodox.

But, alas, these Christians were frivolous, luxurious, and licentious, and they were ready at any moment to turn a religious dispute into a sanguinary fray. It is needless to point out how true this was also of Constantinople, and of Alexandria, and other great centers of the Orthodox Christians of the East. They were zealous for the true Faith, but they were as unlike the Divine Master as the heathen themselves.

In their pursuit of speculative truth, they had overlooked the fact, that, except as a means to attain a certain end, doctrine has no abiding value. Of what avail was it, that their creed was accurately orthodox, if it had lost its power to touch the heart, and to sanctify the life?

In such a case the Faith was dead.

There was a great contrast in the conditions influencing the development of the Church in Eastern and Western Europe. In some respects Western Europe was a new country. It possessed only one great city, famous not only because of its size, its wealth, and its antiquity, but because for ages it had been the seat of power, and of authority.

The local church at Rome inherited from the city a prestige and dignity far above the merits of the obscure and uninfluential Bishops who in the first and second centuries occupied the Episcopal chair in the imperial city; and the spirit of pagan Rome insensibly and inevitably leavened the Church, and shaped its policy. It became Roman in its methods and aims, and when it was suddenly called from danger and ignominy, to occupy the seat of power, with a vast and varied scene of action opening up to it, more than ever was it constrained to frame itself on the model of secular administration, and to imitate the polity and the philosophy of the civil rulers of the Western world.

The secular idea of government was a centralized despotism, and the Roman mind, with its governing instinct, and its tendency to mould under one central authority all the varied forces it could

control, powerfully influenced the trend of Christian effort. The Western Church gradually became a great ecclesiastical organization, with central unity to secure practical efficiency, and to assimilate all available forces wherever they might be found. It faithfully moulded itself on the imperial model, of the old pagan empire, and in the course of time presented the aspect of a powerful machine, moved by one central authority.

The system had its advantages, but there were faults also in the process of construction. The builders of the Western Church, intent on practical efficiency, seized the elements of their age, and combined them to subserve the purposes of utility. They thought more of the work these forces could be made to do, than of the quality of that work. Purity of doctrine was a secondary consideration. And the result they attained was a compromise between truth and error. Customs and beliefs were pressed into service which could add energy to the Church. If a superstition had a stronger hold on backward minds than a true Christian belief, the superstition was utilized. If a semi-pagan custom was dearer to the heart of a rude people than the pure worship of a spiritual age, the custom was adopted.

And so, with their hearts set on the practical effectiveness of the machine they were building up, those Roman organizers framed an ecclesiastical structure in which much clay was mingled with the iron. Captivated with the dream of an imperial Church, the counterpart in its despotic unity of the secular empire, they forgot that this external organization was only valuable as a means to secure a certain end; for unity and energy were worthless unless they served to reproduce in the children of the Church, the Character and the Life of Christ. They were so busy in forming a strong united Church, that they neglected the duty of imparting to the children of the Church, the Faith once delivered to the Saints, for the edifying of the Body of Christ; so that all might come in the unity of the Faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man.

And at length the results were so pitifully unlike those which the Gospel required, that it became apparent to all that something was needed to supplement the work which the Church was doing. The life of the ordinary mediæval Churchman was so unchristian, that it was felt something must be done to supply the ideal of Christian life. It was considered hopeless to expect this from men living amid the circumstances of ordinary life.

To become real Christians, disciples of Christ-like character, it was felt that men must be separated from the world, and guarded in some quiet retreat where the violence, the sensuality and the sordid selfishness of the world could not reach them. There, in the inner court of the temple, separated from all vain and unhallowed associations, it was thought that the Christian character, cleansed by penitence, and adorned with the fruits of the Spirit, might grow up to a perfect man.

I do not wish to under-estimate the part played by the monk in the up-building of the nations of Western Europe. In the Providence of God he was of inestimable value, in those savage days when learning, and art, peace, and love, science and manufacture had scarcely a lodgement anywhere, save within monastic walls.

When the world was filled with violence, it was a good thing that somewhere the ideal of the Christian life was in a measure preserved. Lawless violence and lustful rapacity were rebuked by the quiet, peaceful monastery, and savage spirits were reminded of an eternal judgment-seat, and of the repentance that must anticipate the meeting with a righteous God.

But the monk, also, bore witness that the Church had failed in its mission. With all its

appearance of unity, strength and efficiency, it had, in the very plenitude of its power, abandoned the purpose of its Master, to be the conqueror of the world; and, despairing of bringing humanity to His feet, had retreated within monastic walls, as the only refuge, where it might be hoped the prince of this world would not prevail. If to save themselves from corruption, the more spiritually minded members of the Church must withdraw from the rest, how hopelessly degraded and secular would not the residue become, and how complete a reversal was this of the parable of the gospel, which compared the kingdom of heaven to leaven, abiding in the midst of the unquickened mass until all was leavened!

It was found, also, that the monastic cell was by no means free from the assault of temptation. A life of formal restraint was not the equivalent of a life of free service, and when in the round of daily duty the redemption of the degraded and sinful found no place, save through alms or intercessions, good men were apt to grow selfish in feeling, mechanical in devotion, and self-indulgent in practice.

Along side of the corruptions of the world, there arose the corruption of the monastery, demanding with equal urgency the most radical

reformation. If the theological speculation of the East, in its anxiety to repeat an accurately orthodox creed had failed to fulfil the purpose for which the Faith was delivered to the Saints, the policy of the West to subordinate other considerations for the sake of securing outward unity, and energetic efficiency in organization, had been equally unsuccessful. Both were useful as means to an end, but both had forgotten the purpose of the Master of the Church, in their earnest *attention to the means*.

When the light of more peaceful days began to break in, on the darkness of those ages of violence, in which the nations of Europe were struggling upward, to some realization of law and liberty, many earnest souls could be observed, straining their vision to discern a more excellent way, by which the children of men could be brought to the feet of the Saviour.

They felt that religion was more than the verbal confession of an orthodox faith, that it was more than a mere matter of organization, that it was more than collective acts of piety, more than an attendance on religious functions, and complying with specified religious rules. They were convinced that religion was a personal matter, and that its essence consisted, not in external acts, but in a purified state of the affections, constituting a

mystical union between the Spirit of Christ and the soul. They attached great importance to the act of faith, by which the individual soul was supposed to connect itself with Christ, and enter into a heavenly life which they called conversion.

It was a salutary thing to call attention to the personal element in religion. The individualism which the reformers preached, reminded men that the Gospel of Jesus Christ was for the whole world, and not for a favored few, who had separated themselves, and retired to the cloisters; it proclaimed that for the men digging in the field, or serving in the shops, there was the same calling to a life of conscious communion with God, that the monk was supposed to enjoy!

The field was the world, and everywhere the Prince of Peace asked for worship, service and obedience. The danger of the reformer was his tendency to substitute feeling for fact, and to gauge the strength and purity of his faith by the intensity of his emotions. Absorbed in seeking mystical communion with Christ, or in describing the blessedness of personal intercourse with Him, he was disposed to undervalue the active life of Christian self-denial, and service. And of what value was emotional exaltation of the spirit, unless it served as a motive power, constraining a man to

be like Christ, in conduct, and in action, and leading him in everyday duty to imitate His example?

In mediæval Christianity there was a tendency to divide the Church into classes, the religious, and the secular, and among the reformers there was a tendency to reproduce that separation in the individual life. Life, with them, had its Sunday aspect, and its week-day appearance, its religious side and its secular side. The same man would be fervently pious, and intensely worldly, fanatically religious, and yet practically immoral. The religious life was confined to the place of prayer and seemed to exercise little influence over the relations of ordinary life.

The man who in his religious life was fervent and sincere, might yet be harsh, unlovable, and even dishonest in his secular life. He might rejoice in the intensity of his religious feeling, and yet he was no true Christian, he was not like Christ.

It is our duty, and our privilege, to profit by the errors of the past, and to heed the warnings that the teaching of experience sounds in our ears. We are conscious of the imperfections of those different forms of Christian activity, the theological speculation of the Eastern Church, the desire in the Western Church to imitate the methods of

secular empire, in outward organization, and the religious emotionalism of a subsequent age, and we can see the cause of their failure to accomplish the purpose for which the Church exists.

In each case the failure was caused by forgetfulness of the purpose of the means of grace, and a substitution of the means for the end, which alone gives them value. We have awakened to some realization of the fact that the Faith is dead unless it does its work, by making men like Christ, in thought, in feeling, in character, and in action.

Testimony is reaching us from many quarters, from widening streams of thought, from enlarged ideas of charity, from the pressure of social and economic problems, from the complex necessities of human life, that the Christian counsels of perfection, are after all practical counsels, and that, whatever may be the remonstrances of worldly wisdom, and the protests of human selfishness, the true code of ethics is the Sermon on the Mount, and the model of action the example of Jesus Christ.

No doubt, there are many, who, like the Churchmen of the middle ages despair of reproducing the Mind of Christ in this evil generation; and ages of effort may be required before the example of our Saviour will be freely exemplified

among men; but, nevertheless, it is true that the Faith can only edify the Saints in proportion as it brings them into conformity with the image of Christ.

The world is apprehending this truth. It is conscious that it is the duty of the Church to make men like unto Christ. That is the meaning of the taunt of the scorner who pronounces Christianity a failure. That is the real significance of the defiance of the infidel. That is the explanation of the indifference of multitudes who should be strenuous supporters of the Faith. That is the interpretation of many a strange social and ethical movement fermenting in the midst of modern society.

They all are bearing witness to the character of Jesus the Christ. They may be, and probably are, blind to the significance of their own testimony; but one by one they testify to the true Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. They recognize that the vocation of the Church, is to reproduce the Life of Jesus Christ in the world, and to lead men to know that Life, and to love it, and copy it.

So far as it falls short of this, the Church fails to accomplish its mission. For this purpose the Faith exists. And the apprehension of the

dogmatic truths of the Creed ; or the marshalling of the spiritual forces of the Church in effective organization, or the mystic communion of the Spirit with the Christ that we confess in the Creed, are nothing else than means to attain this end ; and, so far as they fail of their appointed purpose and fruition, so far are they like the body from which the spirit has departed. The hostile voices that we hear, have been raised because the Church has failed in its purpose. We may be thankful that it has awakened to a sense of its true vocation. For now it seems to see with undimmed vision that the Gospel of Jesus Christ should be the rule of the disciple's life.

But, like the Christians of other ages, we have our dangers which threaten to bring to naught the work our Lord has committed into our hands. Seeing the end plainly, we are prone to be impatient of the conditions of success in attaining to it. At one time men exhausted their energy so completely in defining the Faith, that they seemed too feeble to follow definition by practice. And now we would overlook the means, or impatiently thrust it aside, and attain at once to the end, forgetting that there is a ladder let down from heaven to earth, and that the way upward must be traversed step by step before we can sit down in heavenly places.

During the present century it has not unfrequently been assumed that Christian liberty, equality, and fraternity would pervade every heart, and adorn every life in a community, if a group of people would only meet together and vote to follow this rule. But efforts to realize this ideal have been hopelessly disappointing. The necessary preliminary means had not been used to attain the desired end. The ground had not been cultivated, the seed had not been sown, and yet a harvest was expected.

In vain will we gather together a community of men who have resolved to form a Christian republic of love, unless we first endow these men with the spiritual qualifications which will make liberty safe, equality orderly, and fraternity just. And these qualities are not made to order. It is a slow process to create them and bring them to maturity. Before they can become the basis of practical endeavor, a generation which has imbibed the evangelical spirit must bequeath its development to others, and these generations must enlarge and intensify this spirit until it becomes the ethos of the race, and thus the ground may be prepared where the ideal of a Christian community can flourish.

Of what avail is law without public sentiment behind it? The law regarding murder is the same

in two communities. But in one the murderer is promptly hanged, and in the other his life is reasonably safe unless he is lynched. So powerless is law without public opinion behind it.

Only after long ages of faithful preaching of the Word of God did the Church so impress on our race the law of liberty, that personal freedom, righteousness, and justice have become a passion among the English-speaking people. Contrast that love of liberty, and that scornful hatred of injustice, with the ideas pervading the great French nation, as exemplified in a famous case now agitating that whole people, but with no certainty whatever that even the tardiest justice will be meted out to the victim of evident conspiracy and forgery. What a conception this tragic event gives us of the debt we owe as a people to the Church!

If, in the long ages of its stewardship, the Gallican Church had given to the people the Word of God "in the language understood by them" with that unwearied faithfulness, with which the Church has given to us the English Bible; freedom, and right, and law would be as precious there as they are with us. The first step in progress, therefore, is the formation of a character that can bear improvement, and it is a fatal mistake to think

we can dispense with the means, by which alone that character can be formed. Behind the realm of things visible is another kingdom, the domain of spirit. In the spirit is the seat of the habitual thoughts, and impulses and desires, and only Spirit can contend with spirit and overcome it. It alone can enter into that realm of the invisible, and meet and subdue that intangible but most potent energy, the spirit or character.

For this purpose the Son of God was manifested. For this purpose He has promised His Spirit, to convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. And only when that conquest is achieved, can the formative work follow, the edifying of the saint, till he comes in the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God to a perfect man.

My brethren, we are ministers of the Church and we must settle firmly in our minds what it is we are depending on, for the work of the ministry.

What is the power behind us? On what does the Church depend for its victories? Is it simply a certain temper, and character transmitted from one generation of believers to another? Can we speak of the spirit of the Church, as we would of the spirit of a race? If so, then it is only a human thing subject to the laws of decay. It may be a

formidable force, like the spirit of the Saracen, or of the pagan Roman; its reign may be long, but its doom is sure.

If the spirit of the Church is only the consistent purpose of a body of men who have caught the enthusiasm of a great prophet, and have embodied the principles of his teaching in their thought and life, then we may be sure the triumphant anticipations of the New Testament will never be realized, and the prophecy of the Saviour, that He would draw all men unto Him, will come to naught. For if the Spirit, that power which moves the Church, is only a human thing, subject to waste and decay, the fate of the old faiths of the past will be the fate of the religion of Jesus.

But the Founder of the Church was not merely the greatest Man that ever lived, who has communicated His character and aspirations to His followers, He is God made manifest in the Flesh, and His Spirit is not a mere influence or energy, but a Living Person. If the Spirit of Christ had only been an influence, or impulse, caught from Him, how absurd would be His saying: "It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Spirit will not come to you;" for, in that case, how could it be better that the personal source of this influence should be removed? But

when with the Apostles we comprehend that the Spirit of Christ is a Living Person, moving over the darkness of the soul and infusing the Light and the Life of Christ, and for this purpose abiding in the Church from generation to generation, then are we certain that the power behind our ministry, the Spirit of the Church, the weapon of our warfare, will forevermore be found mighty to the pulling down of strongholds.

In our eagerness to make men like Christ, we must not forget that the result can only be produced by the Holy Ghost. He is the secret Power which has won all the notable victories of the Church in its long warfare with the world. To Him is due those successive victories of love, the abolition of slavery, the elevation of woman, the modification of the ferocity of war, the recognition of human rights, the supremacy of law, the service of the sick, the outcast, the feeble, and the poor, and He is the abundant justification of the optimistic hope that there shall be a restitution of all things, and that the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of God and of His Christ.

We know that the Spirit of the Church is a Divine Person, and that the loving Will of our Redeemer is Omnipotent. Whatever may be the aspect of the world, however hostile its intellect,

however antagonistic its ambitions, and lusts, the vision of a redeemed world will surely come. The future does not belong to the power of wealth, vast as its resources may be, nor to the rulers who command the armaments that seem to rule the earth and the sea; it belongs to an unseen Spiritual Power, and the heir of the ages is He who sends that Power on its mission, the meek and lowly Jesus.

Since He set up His throne on Calvary, and reigned from the tree, great empires have come and gone; the Roman, the Turk, and the Spaniard, in succession, have dominated the world, and after a little space, their day has set in darkness. But through all these mutations of the kingdoms of this world, the Church of Christ has grown and strengthened, until it has taken as its possession the utmost parts of the earth. "Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." The only power that can bring about the great change in life and character, and renew men in the spirit of their mind, and lead them to put on the new man which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness is the Holy Ghost.

In seeking the end for which the Church exists, the formation of a generation of Christ-like men, whom the King will not be ashamed to call

His brethren, let us not forget the means by which the result alone can be attained. The transformation is the work of the Holy Ghost; and His method, we are told, is to take of the things of Christ and show them unto us; He is the great Teacher who can bring us one by one in the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God to a perfect Man. "He shall teach you all things."

The Creed sums up this teaching. Its author is the Holy Spirit. Like Him it changes not; it is the Faith once delivered to the saints. "Who-soever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith." He must listen to the Divine Teacher who alone can make him wise unto salvation; he must submit his mind to receive truths that eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, and which have not entered into the heart of man; but which God hath revealed unto us by His Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.

Hence, my brethren, in our life and in our ministry, we must with devout steadfastness hold the Creeds of the Church in their fulness.

Every assault against the verities of the Catholic Faith, veiled though it be behind the apology of seeking to accommodate the Faith to the needs

of a modern world, or justified by the assertion that the assailant is seeking after truth, and must be fearless in his investigations, or excused because the individual is impatient of creeds and dogmas, and pleads that they fetter his spirit, and prevent the free and willing service his soul longs to offer to the Saviour; every assault, I say, sets back in some degree the victory of Jesus over the world; for it is a resistance of the Spirit who takes of the things of Christ, and, in the Creed, shows them unto us.

While holding fast the truth, that the purpose for which the Church was created, and for which the Faith was delivered to it, is to make men Christ-like, and that, no matter how earnest for an orthodox faith the Church may be, no matter how complete and efficient in organization, no matter how eager to realize an exalted spiritual condition, it has failed in its purpose if it is not making men Christ-like, we must hold with equal tenacity the complementary truth, that the Holy Spirit alone can produce this result, and that His method is to take of the things of Christ, and show them unto us. It is His testimony we repeat when we stand and say, "I believe." It is to Him the Christian owes the solemn confession, "I know in whom I have believed."

Our religion is supernatural. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is not the history of a remarkable man of blameless life. It is the proclamation of the love of God for perishing sinners, to save whom He sent His Only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him might not perish, but have everlasting life. It proclaims that for us men and our salvation, He who counted it no prize to be on an equality with God, emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, and was made Man, and became obedient unto death. It declares that through His Blood we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins. It solemnly warns us that God commands all men everywhere to repent, because He "hath appointed a day, in which He will judge the world in righteousness, by that Man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead." It declares the glorious purpose of God in exalting His only Son Jesus Christ to be a Prince and Saviour, and in conferring on Him all power, both in heaven and in earth. It reveals that our Saviour is the heir of all things, the Conqueror who will subdue all things unto Himself, so that to Him every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that He is Lord.

This mighty conquest is "not by might nor by power" (although the Christ is omnipotent), "but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

The pressure compelling the conquered to bow the knee and to confess that Christ is Lord, is the constraint of the Spirit of Love. It was to accomplish this Mighty Conquest that the risen Lord formed His Church, and endowed it with a commission to run to the end of time; and placed within it the abiding Presence of the Holy Ghost, the Lord, and Giver of Life, and sent it forth to accomplish its mission. Our Creed is the solemn confession, taught by the Holy Ghost, of that undying truth, by which the Church in its corporate capacity, and we, as its individual members, must live, and work, and grow in the knowledge of the Son of God towards perfection.

No portion of the Spirit's testimony can we surrender. Nay, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ, that we may all come in the unity of the Faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, we need the whole creed confessed by the intellect, apprehended by the heart, and translated into a life of service and of sacrifice, which, however imperfectly, will reflect the Mind of Christ.

In conclusion, my brethren, we will not forget how wide is the difference in the capacity of men. Having gifts differing one from another, there will always be occasion for charity in our judgment of other men; and this attitude becomes those who are warned not to think of themselves more highly than they ought to think, but, to think soberly.

Remember always that your brethren may be as loyal to the Faith as yourself, although they look at it from another point of view. The Faith is larger than the capacity of the human mind. And we are one-sided, as well as finite. We do not prophesy according to the proportion of the Faith.

When we recite the Creed, we do not all put the emphasis in the same place. The doctrine of Holy Baptism, or the Doctrine of the Sacramental Grace of the Holy Communion, or the Doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, or the Doctrine of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, may be most in the thought of a disciple, or one man may adore Christ crucified, while another rejoices in Him as the King with many crowns. And yet they all hold the Faith in a pure conscience.

One type of Christian character, dwelling on the truth that God is a Spirit, and they who wor-

ship Him must worship Him in spirit, may see only a form of unbelief in the temper which finds its highest spiritual uplift in the adoration of our Lord's presence in the Sacrament under the veils of bread and wine—it may seem that this craving after something material and tangible in worship, is really the faithlessness which refuses to worship God in spirit.

And, on the other hand, the disciple whose highest privilege is sacramental worship, may see in the attitude of his brother the faithlessness that does not discern our Lord's Body.

But in reality both are loyal in their full acceptance of the Faith once delivered to the Saints; but, as they have received gifts differing one from another, these qualifications for service necessarily cause them to behold the vision of the City of God from different points of view, and affect the nature of the service they render, and the confession of the true Faith to which they all loyally bear witness.

But if we will keep before our eyes continually the end for which the Church exists, viz, to make men like Christ, and that our confession of the Faith has been true and vital in proportion as it has formed the reflection of Christ's image in our character and habits, it will help us to think of

ourselves as we ought to think; and it will help us to a wide charity in judging our brethren in the Church who differ from us in their apprehension of the proportion of the Faith; because of the consciousness of our need of charity when judgment is passed on the meagre and imperfect service that we have been able to render.

Let us never forget that the confession of the Faith is a privilege. The last sign of the abandoned, St. Paul tells us, is that they are reprobate concerning the Faith.

The most terrible of judgments that came on the dark heathen world, when it abused the light of natural religion, was that God gave them over to a reprobate mind.

The Faith is not man's invention, it is God's gift, committed to the Church which He has commissioned and endowed to be the keeper and witness of the truth.

It speaks with the voice of Divine Wisdom, when it teaches us the Faith, and we must will to believe the truth which the Church delivers.

There may be mysteries which our feeble understanding cannot adequately grasp; depths in the Infinite opened up to us that our vision cannot penetrate, and we may often need to repeat the disciples' prayer, "Lord, increase our faith."

But, using faithfully the means of grace given us, and striving to realize in a life of active self-denial, and service, the end for which the Faith is given, the clear vision of faith will at last be ours. "If any man will do His will, he shall know the doctrine."

Sacraments, and Creeds, Holy Scripture itself, and whatever other gifts the Redeemer hath given to men, have but one purpose; they are for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ. They are the means of grace.. Through their appointed use, not otherwise, have we any reason to hope that we will attain this end.

And your defense of the Creed, your clear intellectual apprehension of its verities, your reverence for the Sacraments, and frequent use of them, your loyalty to the Church, your erudition in Holy Scripture are as nothing, unless this result is steadily being attained; the approximation in the unity of the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God to a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

III.

The Sacred Ministry.

“No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.” Hebrews v. 4.

THE Sacred Ministry is a subject that comes home to us very closely. We have been called, or are about to be called, to a holy office. What does our Church tell us with regard to its Ministry? It lays down as one of its fundamental principles that its Ministry is of Divine origin; that it holds its commission, and authority from our Lord Jesus Christ, and that by uninterrupted succession from the Apostles its Bishops, priests, and deacons have received the Office, and administration to which they have been called.

In the XXVI. Article of Religion the Church declares “that its Ministers of the Word, and Sac-

raments, act not in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority." In the XXIII. Article of Religion it forbids anyone to take on him the office of public preaching, or ministering of the Sacraments, before he be lawfully called, and sent, to execute the same. And it adds, that those persons are lawfully called, and sent, who have been chosen and called to the work of the Ministry by those to whom public authority has been given, in the Church, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

In the preface to the Ordinal it appeals to Holy Scripture, and to history.

"It is evident," it says, "unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture, and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." It goes on to say that no man was permitted to execute any of those offices, who had not been tested as to his qualifications for the Ministry, and then ordained with imposition of hands, by lawful authority. It forbids men to execute any of the functions of a Bishop, priest, or deacon, who has not had Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination.

It seems unnecessary to add to this testimony

by quoting the language of Ember Collects, and of the various Offices of the Prayer Book to indicate the mind of the Church regarding the Sacred Ministry. In considering the fundamental principles of the Church, we must be guided by the voice of the Church alone. Where it speaks to us, through its authorized formularies in the Prayer Book, or through its Articles of Religion, or through its canonical legislation, we may be sure we are listening to the voice of the Church.

This is a very different thing from the private opinions or practices of its servants. Its ministers may often be unfaithful; they may betray the trust committed to them, but their disobedience does not invalidate the testimony of the Church.

We know, for example, the mind of the Church regarding marriage. It is plainly set forth, in the Marriage Service, and canonical enactments have declared the re-marriage of divorced persons, saving the innocent person, where the divorcee is granted for adultery, unlawful. But a clergyman might, and I fear sometimes does, marry such persons and admit such persons to the sacraments. But the act of the unfaithful servant, be he Bishop, priest, or deacon, does not change the mind of the Church regarding the law of Marriage.

So, also, the individual opinion of any Churchman, or any lax custom, that may have obtained in any period of the Church's history, does not alter its mind regarding the Sacred Ministry.

It plainly declares that its Ministry holds a Divine commission, that it speaks in the name of Christ, and with His authority and credentials. It declares that from the days of the Apostles, the Ministry has consisted of the three Orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; ordained always with imposition of hands, by those having authority in the Church to call men to labor in the vineyard of the Lord. And it adds that "no man shall be taken or accounted a lawful Bishop, priest, or deacon of this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination."

The fundamental principle of the Christian Ministry is that it is derived from our Blessed Lord Himself, from whom it is perpetuated by Episcopal Ordination. Our Lord Jesus Christ, having overcome death, and him that hath the power of death, has received all power in heaven and on earth. He is the King of kings, and in Him are all the gifts and graces needful for the up-building of His Church. He is the true Vine, and has every office of salvation in Himself.

He is the one Apostle or Messenger of His Father. He is the High Priest of our profession, the Bishop and Shepherd of our souls, and the one true Deacon, who came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His soul a ransom for many.

Being thus endowed, He was pleased to choose men to continue His personal ministry in the Church which He had purchased with His own Blood, and these persons He solemnly commissioned, and to them and their successors He promised His Presence to enable them to accomplish His Will, until the end of the world. "As My Father hath sent Me even so send I you." "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

It was evident, from the very first, that ministerial agency was a leading principle of His Kingdom. He had many disciples. St. Paul tells us that there were more than five hundred of these, who could personally bear witness of His resurrection, having seen Him themselves, after He rose from the dead.

But it was not His will that the general assembly of His disciples should be His chosen witnesses. From the first, He made that fact evident. Calling together His disciples, He chose

twelve, whom also He named Apostles. From that day they were His ministers. By them He baptized, by their hands He fed the multitudes, and to them He said, "I have chosen you, and ordained you." To them alone, at the outset, He gave authority to preach, to baptize, to absolve, to administer the Holy Communion. "He, through the Holy Ghost, had given commandment to the Apostles, whom He had chosen."

It was evidently His will that something analogous to Apostolic Succession should be the principle on which Church authority should be transmitted. He did not act on the theory that all ecclesiastical power is vested in the whole body of the disciples, and that ministers, when performing the duties of their office, are simply the delegates of the people, doing what the whole body of believers could not conveniently do.

He could easily have ordered matters so that the principle of popular rights should be maintained, had He so willed. He might have chosen the twelve Apostles by popular election; controlling the whole body of His disciples to choose them, for the hearts of men are in His hand, but He did not do so. He selected them personally, and committed the supreme control of the entire Church into their hands.

The first act of the Apostles was to fill the place of Judas, the traitor, not by popular election, but by lot; and so far as the sacred history informs us, these Apostles were the only Ministers, until the selection and ordination of the "Seven"; although it is probable that elders and deacons already existed. It would be strange if the "Seventy," whom our Lord appointed, should all have ceased to exercise their ministry, and the fact that the names of the "Seven" indicate that they were selected as the representatives of the interests of the Hellenists, seems to imply that the Hebrew portion of the Church was already fully represented.

The "Seven" were designated for an office of a secular character, the administration of the funds of the Church; yet they were set apart for it, by the imposition of the hands of the Apostles. It is the first Christian ordination, after our Lord's Ascension, and it teaches us that, according to Apostolic rule, every Minister of the Church required this imposition of Apostolic hands.

If it was necessary to lay hands on these men to consecrate them to serve in a comparatively secular office, surely, none would be suffered to administer the Word and Sacraments without ordination.

Next in order we read of the Confirmation of the Samaritans, whom Philip had converted, and baptized. Although this Minister of the Church could preach the Gospel with such power that many among the Samaritans believed on our Lord Jesus Christ, although he had authority to baptize, although he had power to work miracles, yet there were ministerial functions that he had not been empowered to perform. Two of the Apostles had to go to the Samaritans, and by prayer and the laying on of hands confer on them the gift of the Holy Ghost.

It was, therefore, the will of God that in the Christian Ministry there should be an order of men empowered to perform some spiritual functions, without power to perform all. The Acts of the Apostles records, in the nineteenth Chapter, another Confirmation; where, after Christian Baptism, an Apostle lays his hands on the disciples and they receive the Holy Ghost. It indicates that it was the rule in Apostolic days, and St. Paul's question to the Ephesian disciples, "Have you received the Holy Ghost since you believed?" shows how carefully Confirmation was observed in all cases.

We learn, also, from the Confirmation of the Samaritans, that no ability to judge the spiritual

fitness of the disciple rested in the Apostles and Evangelists of the first age of the Church. Neither Peter nor Philip could say whether a man was rightly prepared for baptism or Confirmation. They could only judge by external appearances. They possessed none of the attributes of infallibility.

We also see that it made all the difference in the world whether a man was rightly prepared or not. In the one case he received the Holy Ghost, in the other he received nothing but greater condemnation. Simon, the sorcerer, is baptized by Philip and confirmed by Peter and John, but they confer no blessing on him; he remains in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity, and has neither part nor lot in the heritage of the saints, because his heart had not been right in the sight of God, when he confessed the Faith in baptism.

How strongly does this tragedy enforce the Apostolic precept, "Judge yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord." The faithfulness of the Ministry cannot supply moral sincerity in the disciple.

The statement of the inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the Laying on of Hands is one of the principles of the doctrine of Christ, as universal in its obligation, as repent-

ance, faith, and baptism, of itself teaches that it is God's will that successors of the Apostles should ever remain in the Church, to confer this grace which He had reserved to the Apostolic Order.

While the Church was confined to the little city of Jerusalem, the permanent population of which was probably not more than 50,000, the Christian Ministry might practically remain in the Apostolate, as in a germ; but when, as the consequence of persecution, it began to spread abroad throughout the world, a delegation of ministerial powers to other men became necessary.

Presently we find other Apostles mentioned, besides the Twelve: James, the brother of the Lord; Paul, Barnabas, and others; and at the same time we observe that, instead of the one centre of Christian activity at Jerusalem, churches have sprung up throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria. The control of the Church at Jerusalem by the twelve Apostles, acting as one body, is ended. One of their number attains the crown of martyrdom, and probably the rest were dispersed among the different churches, to avoid bitter persecution.

At all events, the headship of the Church in Jerusalem devolves on one man, James, the brother of the Lord. He was not one of the Twelve, but

had been added to the company of the Apostles; and we find him, for years, ruling the Church at Jerusalem as its ecclesiastical head.

When Peter escapes from prison, he asks that notice be sent to James and the brethren. When the first Council is held at Jerusalem, James sums up the debate, and his powerful influence determines the policy of the Church on the burning question that then was troubling the peace of many.

Long years after, when St. Paul comes to Jerusalem, after his third journey, he is reported to have had an audience with James, all the elders being present. St. Paul, in mentioning those who seemed to be pillars of the Church, puts this man James before Peter and John, and he refers to the Jewish Christians who gave him so much trouble at Antioch as certain persons, "who had come from James"; doubtless because they had letters commendatory from the head of the Church at Jerusalem. All these notices substantiate the ancient tradition, that James was the first Bishop of Jerusalem.

About the time that James was appointed the head of the Church at Jerusalem, we hear of another order of Church officers, the Elders. When they were first appointed, or what was their office,

we are not told. The first notice of them is the statement that the alms for the relief of the poor Christians at Jerusalem was sent by the hands of Barnabas and Saul, from Antioch, to the Elders. They are mentioned with the Apostles and brethren in connection with the Council at Jerusalem, and we are told they were present when St. Paul had his audience with James, after his third missionary journey. But of their authority and ministry we are told nothing whatever.

Many questions regarding the Apostolic Church at Jerusalem wait in vain for an answer. Whether the elders were the pastors of the different congregations of the city, or a sort of senate under James, the Bishop; what the relations were between the authority of James and the other Apostles; why the elders and brethren of the local Church at Jerusalem joined with the Apostles in laying down the law for the Gentile Christians of Cilicia; and how the Jewish and Christian systems were reconciled, so that men were Christians and yet zealous for the law—for even St. Paul walked orderly and kept the law, while protesting against its imposition on the Gentiles—these questions, and many others, we cannot answer.

No doubt much pertaining to the organization of the Church at Jerusalem was temporary, ow-

ing to the Jewish element pervading it, and so is not mentioned in Holy Scripture, as it could not be the rule of the Church in after ages. But, plainly, the Ministry was Apostolic, merging into an Episcopal rule, under James, as the permanent Bishop.

If we turn to St. Paul, we find an Apostle whose mission was from the Lord, and whose jurisdiction was designated by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Ghost said, "Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." With an earnest service of benediction, the Apostles were sent forth on the new errand, to the Gentile heathen.

From that day began the wonderful work of the Apostle to the Gentiles. In many lands he planted the Church, and everywhere ruled it with absolute authority, which he never permitted anyone to dispute. In all his letters there is not a hint that in any of the churches founded by him there was any ministerial organization which would remove it from his supervision, or render it independent of his authority. He ordained elders in every city; he told his converts, plainly, to submit themselves to this appointed Ministry; but the control of all matters he reserved in his own hands. Attached to him there was a staff of Ministers, the

most prominent of whom were Timothy, Titus, Silas, Epaphras, Luke, Erastus, Demas, Aristarchus, and Tychicus, by means of whom he kept up constant communication with the churches under his jurisdiction. Again and again he commands his converts and the whole membership of some particular church, ministers and people, to receive these envoys, or Vicars-Apostolic, and obey them as his representatives.

For example, he says to the Corinthian Church, "I have sent unto you Timotheus, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways, which be in Christ as I teach everywhere in the Church"; and again, "Now, if Timotheus come, see that he may be with you, without fear; for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do. Let no man, therefore, despise him, but conduct him forth in peace, that he may come unto me."

He sends Titus to this troublesome, insubordinate church on another occasion, and notes that his representative had been received "with fear and trembling." In sending him to them again, he designates him his "partner, and fellow laborer"; and with him he sends another vicar, whom he describes as "our brother whom we have oftentimes proved diligent in many things." Tychicus he sends to the Colossians, "that he may know their state."

Such was the oversight or episcopacy exercised by this Apostle over all the churches he had planted. They were all closely watched and controlled, either by himself or by men who were in his confidence, who were attached to his person, as his companions, and consequently knew how he would act, under any circumstances that might arise.

What provision did he make for the government of these churches after his death? We have full information given, in three Epistles, written not very long before his martyrdom, and these give us his determination respecting the supply of the Church's needs.

They contain a solemn transmittal of his Apostolic authority, to these two men, through whom, as his ministers, he had so long acted, and they fail to give any intimation that this authority was to cease, and be superseded by any more democratic form of government. They provide for the exercise of Apostolic authority through individuals, and they make no provision for the government of the Church by Synods of presbyters, all officially equal and deciding their differences by a majority of votes. They assume the continuance of Apostolic authority in the persons of Timothy and Titus.

Timothy is invested with authority over min-

isters and teachers. He is to charge that they teach no other doctrine. He is told the qualifications of Bishops and deacons, as if he alone was to choose them and ordain them. He is the judge regarding elders and widows, as if discipline had been fully committed to him. Again, in his second letter, the Apostle gives directions to Timothy regarding ordination, and he is told how he must deal with heresies and those who fomented them.

So, also, Titus is left in Crete to set in order things that are wanting, and to ordain elders in every city, and he is reminded what the qualifications of the ministry are, as if he alone was responsible for appointment and ordination. Discipline is committed to him fully. He is to rebuke sharply, to rebuke with all authority, and to reject or excommunicate the heretic, after the first or second admonition. It is clear, then, that the Apostle committed to these two men authority over these churches, and all their ministers and teachers.

These three pastoral epistles are the only letters in the New Testament in which there are any directions regarding the government of the churches. In no other epistle is there a word respecting the choice, qualifications, or ordination of ministers, and these three epistles are written to

individuals, men who had long acted as the Vicars-Apostolic of St. Paul, and they are not written to churches. Surely, if it had been God's will that His Church should be ruled after some democratic model, directions would have been sent to the churches themselves.

If the people were to be the source of Church power, or if the authority hitherto exercised by the Apostles was to be vested in a Board of Presbyters, would not these letters have been directed to the churches of Ephesus, and of Crete, or to the presbyters living and working there? Would they not have been told that the power and the responsibility of Church government now devolved on them, and that they must beware, lest any companion or fellow-helper of the Apostle should usurp the power and authority which was now committed to them?

But no such warnings were given. They are not bidden to guard their rights and liberties in this matter of Church government, but are told to submit themselves. Nor is there a hint in these letters that the authority committed to Timothy and Titus was abnormal and temporary, and was to be succeeded by a new kind of Church government, in which there would be no head of the local Church, such as the people hitherto had been accustomed to.

Not a word is said to Titus or Timothy about constituting the elders of Ephesus and Crete into synods and presbyteries, with independent power to ordain and to govern. On the contrary, Timothy is to see that he lays hands suddenly on no man, and Titus is responsible for the ordination of elders in every city.

In the last of the Books of the New Testament we have messages sent to the Angels, or Messengers of the Seven Churches, who, beyond any serious question, were men occupying the place and responsibility of the Chief Pastor. It is noticeable that the various epithets, "dead, cold, hot, poor, rich, blind, naked," characterizing the condition of the different churches, do not agree in gender with *Ecclesia*, but with the masculine noun, *Angelos*. So that, as far as the New Testament testimony is concerned, the Church is represented always as controlled and ordered by Episcopal authority, received from the Apostles. The Ministry was developed, not from below, but from above; not by elevation from the people, but by devolution from our Lord, through His Apostles.

Necessity was the law which governed this development. When the rapid growth of the Church rendered the Apostles unequal to the discharge of certain secular duties, they appointed and or-

dained seven men to execute this function. This was succeeded by the delegation of the duties of teaching, government, and discipline, to presbyters or elders, in congregations over which the Apostles could not exercise any continuous personal superintendence, and these, in turn, were controlled by the Apostles themselves, or by vicars appointed by them for this purpose. Provision is made, so far as we have any knowledge, throughout the Church for the continuance of this Episcopal form of government, by men who have received their commission and authority from the Apostles.

The last glimpse we have of the state of the Church in the Revelation shows that it is everywhere ruled by one man, whom the Apostle recognizes as the head of the Church, and to whom he addresses his letter of rebuke or of encouragement.

When we pass from the New Testament to the records of ecclesiastical history, an impenetrable cloud seems to cover the closing years of the first and the beginning of the second century. But as soon as the cloud lifts, and discloses the state of the Church to our view, before the middle of the second century, in every Christian community we observe there was a chief functionary, uniformly styled its Bishop, with two inferior orders of ministers under him, known as presbyters and deacons.

Under what circumstances did this form of government arise, and with what amount of authority was it invested? Was Episcopacy an institution of Divine origin, absolute and indispensable, or was it destitute of Apostolic sanction and authority? Was it merely an office, desirable, perhaps, to secure good government, which men invented in troublous times, but not at all essential to the existence of Apostolic order?

Whether our Lord, in speaking to His Apostles concerning the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God, outlined the orders of the Christian Ministry, as He knew it was about to take shape in His Church, or whether He left these details to the hour when necessity would demand them, we cannot say. Nothing is recorded. But, probably, the Apostles were left free to act, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, as the welfare of the Church might seem to require, and the Orders of the Church, as they constituted them, have that Divine sanction which the commission implies, "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." They rest on the same ground as Infant Baptism, Confirmation, and the observance of the Lord's Day.

We have seen how the institution of the Christian Ministry developed under the Apostles them-

selves, and, as soon as the light of history breaks in and shows us the state of the Church some fifty years after the fall of Jerusalem, wherever we hear of a local Church, we find it, without exception, under the government of a Bishop, and that without any indication that there ever was a time when it was otherwise. In the interval between these two dates there is not much information at our disposal, but it distinctly upholds the contention that Episcopacy was the form of government in the Church from the days of the Apostles.

The first Epistle of Clement was, no doubt, written from Rome to the Corinthians, shortly before the close of the first century. He mentions the Ministry there as composed of presbyters and deacons, but he also speaks of the Church there as "obedient to those who have the rule over you, and giving all fitting honor to the presbyters among you"; and he distinctly states that the Ministry is perpetuated by ordinations of the Apostles and their successors in the Episcopal office.

He uses the word "Episcopate" to denote the office of presbyter, and "Bishop" to designate the presbyter, for at that early day the titles of the Ministry had not assumed definite form. Things being always, as Hooker says, "ancienter than their

names," and only after the thing has been adopted for a time does general use agree as to the name.

And the word "bishop," or overseer, was, in the first age of the Church, used to designate the overseer of a vast diocese, and the overseer of a handful of people assembling for worship in some garret.

Bearing that in mind, let us observe the testimony of Clement. "Our Apostles," he says, "knew, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would be strife on account of the office of the Episcopate. For this reason, therefore, they appointed those ministers already mentioned, and afterwards gave instructions that when these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed them in the ministry. We are of opinion, therefore, that those appointed by them, or afterwards by other eminent men, * * * cannot be justly dismissed from the ministry. Blessed are those presbyters, who, having finished their course, have obtained a fruitful and perfect departure" (Clement ad. Cor. C. 44).

Here we observe that the presbyters have not been ordained by their fellow presbyters, but by Apostles, or other eminent men. Apparently the local Church at Corinth, as in St. Paul's day, was superintended by an itinerant episcopate, and either the person whose duty it was to care for it

had died, or had proved unfaithful, as was the case with some of the vicars whom St. Paul employed, as he tells us in the pathetic letters written from his Roman prison. But all the presbyters at Corinth had been ordained by Apostles and other eminent men, and Clement evidently had no idea that any other ordination was possible.

Another fragment from that early age is the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, written, scholars think, by some Jewish Christian for his countrymen in a remote part of Syria. His theology was very inadequate, and his doctrinal instruction very meagre. But he throws some light on the Church organization in the place where he lived. There is a local ministry of Bishops (that is, presbyters) and deacons, but over them we find a ministry of Apostles, prophets, and teachers, not yet localized in any particular Church, but like that ambulatory Episcopate by which St. Paul governed the Churches. The functions of that higher ministry the writer does not mention, being concerned merely with the duties of the presbyters and deacons; but he implies its right to settle in the local Church when it sees fit to do so.

Next in order comes the disputed testimony of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, against which those who have lost the episcopate and find it nec-

essary to justify themselves have fought so desperately. I presume it is practically settled that the shorter version of the seven Epistles of Ignatius, and not the Syriac version of three of these Epistles, is the authentic utterance of this writer. But, in any case, his testimony with regard to the three orders of the Sacred Ministry is distinct and unequivocal.

In the Syriac version of the Epistle to Polycarp (C. 6.), he says, "Look ye to the Bishop that God also may look upon you." "I will be instead of the souls of those who are subject to the Bishop, and the presbyters, and the deacons." And, at great length, he dwells on the office of Bishops, in the shorter form of the seven Greek Epistles, his theme being, first, the Incarnation, and secondly, the visible organization of Bishops, presbyters, and deacons, in the Church of God. He gives no hint whatever that in the brief interval between the time of the rule of the Apostles themselves and the date of his Epistles, there had been a period when the presbyters exercised functions now reserved to the Bishop.

The testimony of Ignatius explains, also, the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians. For the occasion of the letter of the Bishop of Smyrna rose out of the request of Ignatius, that the Philipplan

Christians would send a letter to the bereaved Church of Antioch. The distance was so great that the Philippians could not send a messenger to Antioch, and they wrote to Polycarp, asking him to forward their message to the sorrowing flock of Ignatius.

The letter of Polycarp, in assent to this request, has been preserved. He writes as a Bishop (Ignatius tells us he was Bishop of Smyrna), the style of his address being, "Polycarp and the presbyters with him"; but he only speaks of elders and deacons, at Philippi. No Bishop is mentioned as living or ruling there. Were, then, the presbyters and deacons the only Church authorities at that time, recognized at Philippi? If the letter of Polycarp stood alone, we might be tempted to answer this question in the affirmative. But it does not stand alone. We read it with the letters of Ignatius, written at that time.

From these we learn that Episcopacy was extended to the ends of the earth. In the 3d Chapter of his Epistle to the Ephesians Ignatius speaks of the "Bishops settled everywhere, to the utmost bounds of the earth." In the 3d Chapter of his Epistle to the Trallians he says: "Let all reverence the deacons as an appointment of Jesus Christ, and the Bishop as Jesus Christ, and the

presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God. Apart from these there is no Church." After writing in this style at Smyrna, he goes his way to Philippi, enjoyed cordial intercourse with the Christians there, and departed, leaving behind him a venerated name and an earnest desire to carry out his wishes.

There is no sign that he rebuked them or remonstrated with them. And yet it is impossible that the man who had declared that without the three orders of the Ministry there could be no Church should suddenly have become indifferent to the absence of a Bishop at Philippi. Probably the true explanation of the state of the Church at Philippi was this: As in the case of the Churches of Asia, in the age of St. Paul, as in the case of the Corinthians, when Clement addressed his Epistle to them, there was no localized Bishop, but they were ruled, and their clergy were ordained by vicars Apostolic, who from time to time visited them, and took order for their spiritual welfare. In fact, it is not unlikely that Ignatius himself was not the localized Bishop of Antioch, but the representative of Apostolic authority in the region of Syria.

Another voice that comes to us out of the mist that covers the period between the Apostolic age and the middle of the Second Century, is the

Shepherd of Hermas. Its exact date is uncertain. Some think it was written about the close of the first century. Some would date it as late as the year 140. Hermas speaks of deacons and of presbyters, or those who occupy the chief seat; and he also mentions rulers as distinguished from those occupying the chief seat; so that he seems to suggest the same orders in the Church that are mentioned in the Epistle of Clement.

Such is the tendency of the fragmentary evidence at our disposal down to the middle of the second century. Beyond question there was then established in every part of Christendom a Ministry of Bishops, priests, and deacons, claiming to be Apostolic in its origin, and in its authority. The Ministry was everywhere recognized as having this character, and nowhere is there a trace of dissent or dissatisfaction on the ground that it was a usurpation of authority, which at one time had been exercised by presbyters and not by Bishops.

Hegesippus was born early in the second century, and he wrote not later than A. D. 175 a collection of memoirs or reminiscences of the Apostolic and post-Apostolic ages. Eusebius had this book under his eye when he wrote his ecclesiastical history, and he quotes from it. We learn that Hegesippus journeyed westward from Syria to

Italy, A. D. 145-150. He met a great many Bishops, and received the same doctrine from all. In the course of his journey he abode many days at Corinth, and mentions Primus, the Bishop of the Corinthian Church. Afterwards, when in Rome, he made a succession (a catalogue) of the Bishops down to Anicetus. He adds, "Now, in each succession, and in each city, it is as the law proclaims, and the prophets, and the Lord." As an illustration of the meaning of Hegesippus in using the word *διαδοχὴν* (succession) we might refer to the work of Sotion on the "successions" or the successive chiefs of the Philosophic Schools. The title of the work is *αἱ Διαδοχαί*.

Hegesippus then had found a succession of bishops in every city.

Such was the state of the Church A. D. 150. The same writer also speaks of the Episcopal succession of the See of Jerusalem, mentioning Symeon as the second Bishop, after the death of James, the brother of the Lord. Contemporary with Hegesippus was Irenaeus, born between the years A. D. 120-130. He was a disciple of Polycarp; of whom he says (III. iii. 4.), that he was instructed by Apostles; and also, by Apostles in Asia, appointed Bishop of the Church in Smyrna. He goes on to say that Polycarp taught the things

which he had learned of the Apostles, and which alone are true, and which the Church has handed down. "To these things all the Asiatic Churches testify, as do also those men who have succeeded Polycarp, down to the present time."

Irenaeus became a presbyter in Gaul, under the Bishop Pothinus, and after the martyrdom of that confessor, he succeeded him. In his contest with heretics, he lays emphasis on the rule of faith, handed down from the Apostles; and the keepers of this sacred tradition are, he tells us, the Bishops of the Church.

He says, "True knowledge is the doctrine of the Apostles, and the ancient system of the Church in all the world, and the character of the Body of Christ, according to the successions of the Bishops, to whom they delivered the Church in each separate place (Bk. IV., xxxiii. 8). He says, "The path of those belonging to the Church, circumscribes the whole world, as possessing the sure tradition of the Apostles, and gives unto us to see that the faith of all is one and the same, since all receive one and the same 'God,' the Father, and believe in the same dispensation regarding the Incarnation of the Son of God, and are cognizant of the same gift of the Spirit, and preserve the same form of that ordination which belongs to the Church, and ex-

pect the same coming of the Lord, and await the same salvation of the whole man, both soul and body" (Bk. V., xx. 1).

There is, we see, in the mind of Irenaeus, a picture of the Universal Church spread all over the world, handing down the truth as delivered by the Apostles; and the bond of union, that connects the generations in the Church, is the Episcopal Succession, to whom, he says, the Apostles delivered the Church, in each separate place. He knows of no exception to this form of Church government. In this day, the terminology by which the offices of the sacred ministry were designated, was still in process of formation. He calls the Bishops, Presbyters in several places, but he makes it plain that he means to designate Bishops ruling the Church as the successors of the Apostles. For example, in his letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome, as quoted by Eusebius (H. E. V. 24. 14), he says, "Among these were the presbyters before Soter, who presided over the Church which thou now rulest. We mean Anicetus, and Pius, and Hyginus, and Tel-esphorus, and Xystus."

Again (Bk. IV. xxiv. 2). He says: "It is incumbent to obey the presbyters, who are in the Church, those who, as I have shown, have the *succession* from the Apostles, those who, together with

the *succession* of the Episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth." In Bk. III. ii. 2., he says: "We refer them to that tradition which originates from the Apostles, which is preserved by means of the *succession* of *presbyters* in the Churches." Then, in the third chapter, he goes on to demonstrate that succession: "We are in a position," he says, "to reckon up those who were by the Apostles instituted Bishops in the Churches, and the *succession* of those men to our own times."

Since it would be tedious to reckon up the successions of all the Churches, "we indicate the tradition derived from the Apostles of the Church organized at Rome by the two Apostles, Peter and Paul, as also the faith preached to men, which comes down to our own time by means of the succession of Bishops. For, to this Church, on account of its special pre-eminence, all Churches must needs come together, and in her the Apostolic tradition has been always preserved by those who are from all parts. The blessed Apostles then, having founded and built up the Church, committed into the hands of Linus the Episcopate. To him succeeded Anacletus, and, after him, Clement was allotted the Bishopric."

And so he goes on to enumerate the succession of the Bishops at Rome to his own day. The *suc-*

cession of presbyters therefore, was, in the language of Irenaeus, simply the succession of Bishops.

There were many presbyters, or elders, in Rome, but one man alone held among them the *succession* from the Apostles, as the ruler of the Church, to whom had been committed the Episcopate.

Tertullian, who was born about A.D. 150, and became a Montanist, probably at the close of the second century, reproduces the argument of Irenaeus, in his contest with heresy. He has two questions for the heretic. "Does he hold the rule of faith?" "Has he the Apostolic succession?" "Let them," he says, "produce the origins of their churches. Let them unroll the line of their Bishops, running down in such a way from the beginning, that their first Bishop shall have had for his authorizer and predecessor one of the Apostles, or of the Apostolic men who continued to the end in their fellowship. This is the way in which the Apostolic Churches hand in their registers, as the Church of the Smyrnaeans relates, that Polycarp was installed by John. So, in like manner, the rest of the Churches exhibit the names of men appointed to the Episcopate by the Apostles, whom they possess as transmitters of the Apostolic seed" (Ter. De. Praesep. 32).

The unchanging rule of faith in Tertullian's mind, is connected with the steadfast Apostolic succession. While the lists of names, which Irenaeus and Tertullian and others, their contemporaries, quoted by Eusebius, may be uncertain, when they mention the succession of the Bishops of a particular Church—for they probably were handing on an oral tradition—yet their testimony establishes these facts: that the Church in their day possessed a ministry of three orders; that it was ruled everywhere by Bishops; that these Bishops were regarded as the successors of the Apostles; and, in ordaining, confirming, and ruling, they exercised those spiritual gifts, which the Apostles had transmitted to them.

As they openly challenged the heretics to produce the accounts of the origins of their Churches, and to unroll the line of their Bishops in such a way, from the beginning, that their first Bishop shall have had for his authorizer and predecessor one of the Apostles, there cannot have been, at that time, anywhere in the Church, in Asia, Europe, or Africa, any ministry not of this Apostolic character; nor can there have been anywhere a tradition, that there had been a period when the ministry was not Episcopal. For how quickly would the heretic have retorted, that the Episcopate was

not Apostolic in its origin, if there was the faintest trace of a tradition that it was a usurpation of powers, originally committed to the presbyters of the Church.

And when we reflect that Irenaeus was born not later than A.D. 130, that he was the disciple of Polycarp, that he was trained in the East, and exercised his ministry and died in the Western Church, his opportunities of knowing the tradition of the Church, everywhere, as regards the origin and character of its ministry, qualifies him to bear witness of the highest value.

He declares that the three-fold ministry of the Church is Apostolic in its origin, and that the Bishops are the successors of the Apostles. He knows of no counter tradition anywhere, and so confident is he in his position, that he cites the Apostolic authority of the Bishops as the guarantee of the faith of the Church. The one, undying Episcopate, with its direct descent from the Apostles, was the assurance of the permanence of Apostolic truth. The Bishop, as the successor of the Apostles, was the depository of primitive truth, the inheritor of Apostolic tradition.

Now, if any where there had been a suspicion that this assertion of the Apostolic origin of the Episcopate was false; if there had been a time

when everywhere in the Church there had been a usurpation, by one man, of powers which hitherto had belonged to all the presbyters, and a denial to these men of the authority to ordain, to confirm, and to rule the Church, which they had formerly possessed; why had it left no trace in any Christian community during that brief interval of thirty years which separated the last of the Apostles from Irenaeus?

But no witness of the second century rises up to call the testimony of Irenaeus in question. That was reserved for men, safely removed by the distance of ages from the facts which they disputed. We may see, then, how temperate is the language of the Church, when it asserts that "it is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scriptures, and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time, there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

The New Testament declares that the twelve Apostles were the depositories of Christ's Commission, as the founders, and governors of His Church. At first, the ministry was within the apostolate; but as necessity required, that ministry was developed, by the creation of the orders of presbyters, and deacons, and the commitment to

them of functions of teaching, of worship, and of discipline, where the Apostles could not personally act.

These ministers were always commissioned for their work by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles. As the work of the Church grew, and time went on, the powers lodged with the Apostles were delegated to other men as their substitutes, and their successors.

In Apostolic days, a localized Episcopate began to take the place of the itinerant oversight of the Apostles, James, the Lord's brother, becoming the first Bishop of Jerusalem, having under him elders, and deacons. St. Paul, during his whole career, as the Apostle of the Gentiles, ruled the many churches he had founded, reserving to himself the power of ordination to the Sacred Ministry, and the right to control with absolute authority. He maintained his constant superintendence by means of a staff of some twenty vicars-apostolic attached to him, who personally visited the churches as he required, and acted as his representatives, and with his authority. In his last days he appointed men, so far as we have any knowledge, to ordain, to rule, and to watch over the churches with full apostolic jurisdiction. Whether the commission of these men for the

churches to which they were sent, was permanent or temporary, whether their authority was that of diocesan Bishops or vicars-apostolic, they certainly acted as the substitutes of the Apostle, and their duties were, in essence, identical with those of the episcopate.

So far, then, as the New Testament is concerned, we are taught that there was no supreme government, except the apostolic oversight, and no principle for transmitting this is recognized, except apostolic succession by laying on of hands. St. John, in the Revelation, addresses his letters to the Angels, or Messengers of the Churches, as if he recognized that everywhere the Church was under Episcopal oversight.

Clement alludes to rulers, presbyters and deacons, as the Ministry of the Church, and takes it for granted that every presbyter at Corinth had, as a matter of course, been ordained by an Apostle, or other eminent men. The obscure writer in some remote part of Syria who gives us his crude conception of Christianity in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," evidently has in mind a ministry similar to that to which Clement refers at Corinth; a local ministry of presbyters and deacons, with an itinerant episcopate, exercising occasional and general superintendence, similar to the

government of the Asiatic churches under St. Paul.

About the time of St. John's death, this itinerant rule of apostolic men became localized, as a diocesan episcopacy; not suddenly, but gradually, so that within ten or fifteen years after the death of the last of the Apostles, Ignatius could speak of it as a settled part of the regimen of Church government. And in the next generation, when from the pen of Hegesippus, of Irenaeus, of Tertullian, we have a distinct account of the state of the Church, we find over all Christendom this episcopal form of Church government, and the Bishops, everywhere acknowledged, as deriving their authority in direct succession from the Apostles, and exercising by virtue of the Divine commission entrusted to them, full apostolic powers.

From that far off past, there comes no tradition that this episcopal authority was a usurpation, although the fullest opportunity is given, for these writers throw down the challenge to the heretics, that the Bishops are the successors of the Apostles. If the enemies of the faith could have denied it, they would have overturned the argument of these champions of the Church. But there was no denial. It was a fact patent to all men in that age of the Church.

In reading the testimony concerning the early government of the Church, we must remember, to quote the words of Hooker, that "things are ancients than their names." We do not first coin a name, and then invent a thing to fit it; but, having invented a new thing, we try one title, and another, to designate it, until by common consent, we at length agree on a name.

We have not yet decided whether the permanent name of the metal road is "railroad," or "railway," whether the railway carriage is a "car" or a "carriage," whether the stopping place is a "station" or a "depot," and often times we wait a very considerable time before a felicitous designation is adopted by the unanimous consent of men.

So, also, it was with the orders of the Christian ministry. The names, apostle, prophet, bishop, presbyter, deacon, were not used accurately, in the New Testament, and among early ecclesiastical writers, as we would use them now. We speak of the ordination of the "seven deacons," yet the word "deacon" is not used to designate them in the New Testament.

St. Paul calls the Saviour a deacon (Rom. 15, 8). He designates himself and Apollos deacons, and yet the deacons mentioned in the first epistle to Timothy (I Tim iii) are beyond doubt an order

of ministers below the presbyters, whereas St. Paul was the Apostle in absolute authority, over the presbyters. Of course, the word was used in the indefinite way, in which the term minister is now employed, to designate bishop, priest, or deacon; and many other offices.

So also the words bishop, and elder, are used indefinitely. The bishop or overseer, was sometimes the man whose business it was to oversee a dozen persons, gathered together in a loft, for worship, and sometimes the name was applied to an officer, like Titus, deputed to oversee all the congregations of the Church, in a large island, with all their ministers of all grades, to ordain these ministers, to rebuke them, if necessary, to try them, to depose them.

Peter, also, calls himself a presbyter, or elder, and, in Acts II. 17, he applies the title to elderly lay people. "Your old men," literally "your presbyters," "shall dream dreams." Yet Peter was surely an Apostle, and belonged to a different class from those elders who met with the Apostles and brethren in the council at Jerusalem. The presbyters, or elders, of Ephesus, summoned to meet Paul at Miletus, are designated by him bishops, or overseers of the flock; and on the other hand Irenaeus speaks of the succession of bishops

at Rome as presbyters. He designates them in his letter to Victor as "the presbyters who presided over the Church which thou now rulest," and then goes on to name them, although he has no idea whatever, of confusing their office with that of the presbyters under their jurisdiction.

Other early ecclesiastical writers, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Firmilian, use the same indeterminate language in referring to the episcopate; for while the office was distinct, and the one Bishop in every diocese was held to be the successor of the Apostles, the name by which that office was designated had not yet been fixed by that common consent and usage which afterwards obtained in the Church.

We could easily add to the volume of the testimony concerning the character of the sacred Ministry in the second century. The Clementine forgeries, probably the work of some unbelieving Jew, and the nidus from which was hatched the Petrine claims, began some time about the year A. D. 150, and they take it for granted, that episcopacy is the rule of government in the Church, and that it derives its succession from the Apostles.

Clement of Alexandria, born about the middle of the second century, only knew of a Church which had a ministry of bishops, priests, and dea-

cons. Hegesippus was the personal friend of the Bishop of Corinth before A.D. 150, and speaks of him as the latest of a succession of bishops there.

But nothing could be added to the positiveness of the testimony we have already considered, that, by unanimous consent over all the world, the sacred Ministry was episcopal, and derived its power and authority by direct succession from the Apostles.

There is no record, I believe, in the history of the early ages of the Church, of a single ordination by presbyters. A Bampton lecturer, who had his limitations as a defender of the Faith of the Church, inasmuch as he seemed to deny that the Acts of the Apostles and the Pastoral epistles were part of the Canon of the New Testament, has tried to make out a case of ordination by presbyters in the early ages of Christianity. He has told us of a presbyter-abbot who promoted one of his companions to the diaconate, and the presbyterate. But when we read the account we find nothing to justify the assertion that the abbot ordained his friend, but simply that he used his influence to have him ordained.

Again, he tells us, that the presbyter Novatus appointed Felicissimus deacon, from which he infers that he ordained him. But Felicissimus

was not the only person appointed to a holy office by Novatus. He also appointed a bishop. The same expression exactly is used, Novatus appointed Novatian Bishop. But in this case we are told how he made the appointment. He did not ordain him, but as Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, writes; "He compelled three bishops, boorish and most foolish men, to give him the episcopate by a vain and shadowy imposition of hands." No doubt, he appointed Felicissimus a deacon in the same way.

The lecturer also cites the case of Calluthus, a presbyter of Alexandria, who ordained one Ischyras. It is an unfortunate illustration. For, in the first place, when Calluthus ordained this man, he pretended to be a bishop. In the second place, the ordination was pronounced null and void, and Ischyras was accounted only a layman, because the person who ordained him was a presbyter.

Two writers, in the fourth century, the unknown person designated Ambrosiaster, and the illustrious Jerome, have contended that originally Christ instituted only one order of presbyter-bishops, and that it was the exigency of Church life, which led to its being divided into the episcopate, and the presbyterate, under apostolic sanction. These writers, observing that the names, bishop

and presbyter, are used in the New Testament to designate the same officers, seem to argue that originally the presbyters were also bishops, and that because of the dangers of rivalry, and division, it was determined that only one person in a particular church should have the authority, and exercise the functions, of the bishop, the rest of the clergy receiving the limited commission which was void of authority, to rule, and to ordain.

The grounds for the view taken by these writers, are merely philological. They bring no historical proof for their theory, except Jerome's assertion regarding the ancient mode of selecting a bishop at Alexandria. It is well to note, however, what it is that they assert. They teach that all presbyters were at first ordained with episcopal functions, that they were bishops in fact, as well as presbyters, but that after a time, only one person in the Church was so ordained, and became the bishop, while all others received a limited commission, which did not include the authority to ordain, or confirm.

And they dwell on the fact, that all orders are in the bishop, that now, none but he can ordain; that none of the clergy who has not been ordained to it, should take to himself any office which he knows not to have been intrusted to him; that it

never was lawful, or permitted, that an inferior should ordain a superior, for nobody gives what he has not received. Whatever they may have thought of this imaginary order of presbyter-bishops, they were agreed that it had passed away, and that no authority to ordain was now vested in the elders of the Church.

But it is doubtful if Jerome ever imagined that there had been an order of presbyter-bishops. He was in a temper, and ready to carry an argument to any length.

He wished to rebuke the deacons of Rome, and exalt his own order. The dignity of the bishops, also was a thorn in his side. And so, he goes on to tell how much greater is the position of a presbyter, than that of a deacon, and to insist that a presbyter could do all that belonged to the position of the bishop, except to ordain.

In fact presbyters, and bishops, he goes on to say, practically were the same, at first, for does not St. Peter call himself, your fellow-presbyter?

The argument is a feeble one. Irenaeus calls the bishops of Rome, even Victor, presbyters. But no one is so simple as to suppose that Victor was merely one of the elders of the Church at Rome, and not universally recognized as the one bishop of that diocese.

Jerome cites, as his historical proof, an ancient custom of the Church at Alexandria. For a considerable length of time, he says, from the days of St. Mark, down to the episcopate of Heraclas, "the presbyters of Alexandria used always to appoint as bishops one chosen out of their number, and placed upon a higher grade; just as if an army were making a general, or deacons were choosing one of themselves, whose diligence they knew, and calling him archdeacon." "For what, except ordination, does a bishop do, which a presbyter cannot?"

The language is ambiguous. But if Jerome means, that no consecration or ordination was necessary, to make a presbyter a bishop, there is no support for his statement, in Latin, or Greek literature.

Origen, who lived in the days of Heraclas, has not a word to say of any such custom, and Athanasius, writing sixty years earlier than Jerome, and knowing far more thoroughly the history of the Church in Alexandria, virtually denies that any such custom ever existed. For he tells us of the presbyter Colluthus, who pretended to be a bishop, and ordained one Ischyras. And at a council of Egyptian bishops, A.D. 340, we are told by Athanasius, the ordination was pronounced worthless. Here is the ancient record:

“How then is Ischyra a presbyter? Who appointed him? Colluthus, was it not? This is the only plea left. But that Colluthus died a presbyter, and that his every ordination is invalid, and all who were appointed by him, in his schism, have come out laymen, and are so treated, is plain, and no person doubts it” (Athanasius, *cont. Arians*, 12).

If there had been any ancient tradition in favor of ordination by presbyters, why did Colluthus pretend to be a bishop when he ordained, and why does this Egyptian council declare that all his ordinations are void, and all his ministers only laymen, because the person appointing them was only a presbyter?

Jerome, in his anger, finds no support therefore, for his argument in the history of the Church at Alexandria. We see then how strong is the statement that from the days of the Apostles there have been these orders in Christ's Church, Bishops, priests, and deacons.

I pass by the attacks that have been made on the validity of our orders, by Romanists. I confess they have no interest for me. When opponents can stoop to lies like the Nag's Head fable, in their desperate effort to make out a case, they put themselves out of court. The reply of the English Archbishops to the late papal condemna-

tion of our orders, is final, and conclusive, for any fair-minded man.

In considering the nature of the Sacred Ministry, the question in our mind should be, "What is the Will of God?" What is the ministry which He has appointed in His Church? I think there can be but one answer. If the Apostles were acting with Divine authority, and under Divine guidance, if, in the gradual unfolding of the ministry, committed to them, as necessity required, until it assumed the form of the three orders, bishops, priests, and deacons, they were acting under Christ's commission, "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you;" if, in requiring before a man assumed any of the duties of this ministry, that he should receive from them, or from their successors, power, and authority, by the laying on of hands in ordination, they were guided by the Divine will, then is it not plain, that the reunion of Christendom must imply the recognition and adoption of this Sacred Ministry, which God has instituted in His Church?

"The various Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist organizations, however worthy of our deep regard, have, in dispensing with the episcopal succession, violated a fundamental law of the Church's existence. The acts of ordination, by

which presbyters in the sixteenth century, or since that time, originated the ministries of these societies, were not authorized by their commission, and did not belong to the office of presbyter which they had received. No such powers were committed to them, when they were ordained. They assumed them, and they did not possess them.

“It is not proved, it is not probable, there is no record, that any presbyter, in any age of the Church, ever had the right to ordain. On the other hand, it is absolutely certain, that for many centuries it had been understood, beyond all question, that only bishops could ordain, and that no presbyter possessed episcopal powers.

“No exceptional dignity, even the exalted position of a presbyter-abbot, ever tempted a minister to transcend the limitations of his office. We do not for a moment deny that God’s grace has wrought through the irregular ministries, which, with sincere intention, have striven to serve our Lord; but we insist that a ministry not episcopally ordained is violating a fundamental rule of the Church’s existence, and working outside the covenant, where security is assured. If this fact is accepted, it has its immediate bearing on the obligations of individuals, who are members of religious denominations, devoid of the Apostolic Ministry.

“But it also should appeal to non-episcopal Christian Societies. The Christian experience of these societies may abundantly testify that the grace of God has wrought effectually among them, and they may be able to show plainly, that their present position has been forced upon them by the unhappy necessities of the past. But it is their evident duty to face the problems of the present, and of the future. They are confronted with the fact, that a divided Christendom is an intolerable reproach to the disciples of our Redeemer, and that its results have been disastrous to the interests of true religion.”*

We are bound to seek organic unity, that the will of Christ may be accomplished; and the results of past experience plainly testify that there is something fundamentally wrong in the old conceptions of Christian liberty, and in the sacredness of individualism. New moral and doctrinal perils urge us, at the same time, to reconsider the basis of Christian life, and order. And the first step in this inquiry should be, “What is God’s will with regard to the Christian ministry?” I think there can be but one answer: The apostolic suc-

* The passage in quotation marks is partly from Canon Gore, but as it is not his wording exactly I do not like to make him responsible for it, so it seems best to insert the quotation marks but not specify the source.

cession of bishops, and priests, and deacons, is the ministry He has appointed for the edification of His Church.

This Sacred Ministry embodies the historical continuity of the Church, and affords a practical basis of union.

It is the one ministry which the Churches possessing it cannot be asked to abandon; for it is, with them, not one merely of many permissible forms of Church regimen, but the Will of God, for the government, and edification of His Church.

It, alone, expresses the mind of Christ regarding a universal spiritual society, in which the apostolic succession of bishops constitutes, by Divine appointment, a visible link, from generation to generation.

It, alone, witnesses to that real spiritual continuity, from age to age, and from century to century, and holds and hands on the authoritative benediction; "As My Father hath sent Me, so send I you." "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

IV.

The Independence of National Churches.

“Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.” Gal. v. 1.

IN the Preface of the Prayer Book of our Mother Church, under the heading, “Of Ceremonies: Why Some be Abolished and Some Retained,” we find this weighty utterance:

“And in these our doings we condemn no other Nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only; for we think it convenient, that every Country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best, to the setting forth of God’s honor and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect, and godly living, without error or superstition; and that they should put away other things, which, from time to time, they perceive to

be most abused, as in men's ordinances it often chanceth diversely, in divers countries."

In this spirit the official work of the reformation of the Church of England was conducted. Recognizing the right, which a National Church possessed, to make such changes as may be expedient, subject to the strict observance of Catholic essentials, English Churchmen proceeded to act on it; but they also recognized it, for other Churches as well as for that of England, and claimed to be the advocates of change and reconstruction, only within the bounds of their legitimate jurisdiction. This independence of National Churches, is one of our fundamental principles. The principle is thus stated by a distinguished scholar:

"A National Church, through the medium of its representative synod, duly convened, has inherent authority, from its Divine Founder, to remove every species of abuse, whether of doctrine, or discipline, existing within its own jurisdiction; nay is absolutely bound by its allegiance to Christ, and its regard for the people committed to its charge, to vindicate, and extend the truths of the Gospel, as once for all delivered to the saints, and taught in the early Church."

It is unnecessary to say, that the Protestant Episcopal Church fully accepts this principle of

the Church of England, and acts on it. In the Preface of our Prayer Book it is counted "a most invaluable part of that blessed liberty, wherewith Christ hath made us free, that in His Worship different forms, or usages, may without offence be allowed, provided the substance of the Faith be kept entire; and that in every Church, what cannot be clearly determined to belong to doctrine, must be referred to discipline, and therefore, by common consent, and authority, may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient, for the edification of the people, according to the various exigencies of times, and occasions."

It has been contended, that a National Church, in regulating its doctrines and discipline privately and apart, without considering the doctrine of the rest of the Church (to quote the words of Bossuet), "separates itself from the Universal Church, and renounces the unity of faith, and doctrine."

But the criticism will not stand the test of history. For it is admitted by all men, that provincial and national synods have, by immemorial practice of the Catholic Church, the right to condemn errors, and heresies, and to correct abuses in particular churches. They have been considered perfectly competent to discuss, and take action, in

all these matters of doctrine, and discipline, with due regard to the traditions of the Universal Church. The rights of provincial synods, to make decrees, in causes of faith, and in cases of reformation, where corruptions had crept into the Sacraments of Christ, were freely allowed, and acted on, more than a thousand years ago.

Paul of Samosata, Sabellius, Arius, Apollinaris, the Donatists, the Pelagians, were all condemned by provincial synods, in the first instance. A provincial council at Rome A.D. 348, condemned the Sabellian heresy. A provincial council at Carthage, A.D. 348, condemned rebaptization. A provincial council at Aquileia, A.D. 381, condemned Palladius for his Arian heresy. An African council, A.D. 416, condemned Pelagianism. Another African council, A.D. 424, decreed the belief and preaching of the doctrine of the Trinity. At Orange, a provincial council handled the great controversies of grace and free will. The fourth council of Toledo actually added to the Creed. Not only did Bishops, in national and provincial councils, reform the particular churches under their care; but asserted that it was their duty to do so.

The fourth council of Toledo decreed that if there happen a cause of faith to be settled, a gen-

eral synod of Spain and Gaul should take action thereon.

That which had been so often practised in many places, with the consent of the whole Church, is surely allowable, also, to a national council, of the Church in England, or in America. But it has been objected, that these churches never acted without regard to the Faith of the Church, and sent their decrees to other Churches for confirmation. To which we may truly reply, that our Church has been more scrupulous regarding the Faith of the Church at large, than any other; and has never made any reformation in doctrine, without the fullest reference to the authority, and usage, of the Universal or Catholic Church.

It was the essential principle of the English Reformation throughout, that the doctrines and traditions of the Catholic Church of Christ in all ages were to be obediently followed. Even Parliament, when it suppressed the Papal jurisdiction, A.D. 1533, declared, that it was not intended to vary from Christ's Church about the articles of the Catholic faith of Christendom.

The Church of England, A.D. 1543, declared the Unity of the Catholic Church to consist, chiefly, in unity of doctrine, and that particular Churches ought not to vary from one another in the said doctrine.

The Archbishop of Canterbury declared: "I intend to speak nothing against One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolical Church, or the authority thereof, the which authority I have in great reverence, and to which my mind is in all things to obey."

The Church, then, when acting with national independence it made such reforms in doctrine and discipline as seemed necessary, did not act without duly considering the doctrine of the Church in all ages. The examples of ancient councils prove that it was not necessary to wait for the reformation of errors and abuses, until the judgment of the existing universal Church could be made known, by means of an Œcumenical Council. If, after taking action, the National Church did not send its decrees to other churches, for their approbation, it was simply because this discipline had long become obsolete; and brotherly intercourse with other Churches had, by their act, been interrupted.

In the assertion of its national independence, the Church of England entered into no contest about the Faith. When the Church in the 16th century asserted its independence, it was a question, not of doctrine, but of money. The primacy of order, which had been freely and justly accorded to the bishop of Rome, had developed gradually into a supremacy of power, and under

the irritation of these constantly increasing encroachments on their liberties, English Churchmen earnestly protested. From the time of the dispute on the subject of investitures, in the days of Anselm, when the King, and his nobles, the bishops, also, and others of inferior rank, were so indignant as to assert that rather than surrender the privileges of their forefathers, they would depart from the Roman Church, down to the final struggle of the sixteenth century, the encroachments of the Roman See called forth spirited opposition, which may be seen in the civil enactments to repel papal aggression, and preserve the liberties of the Church.

The aggressions were made up of these particulars:

A judicial power was claimed by Rome in matters ecclesiastical, or cases of appeal.

Power was claimed to grant licenses, and dispensations.

Liberty was asserted, to send legates into England, and hold legatine courts there. The right was claimed, and exercised, to grant investiture to bishops, to confirm episcopal elections, and to distribute ecclesiastical patronage.

The privilege was claimed, of receiving first fruits, the tenths of English benefices, and the goods of the clergy who died intestate.

It was an attractive scheme of plunder, under which the court of the bishop of Rome could live in splendor, at the expense of the rest of Europe. No portion of the field had contributed so largely, to this golden harvest, as the Church of England.

And the crime of the Church of England, against the papacy, was that it refused to be plundered any longer.

No attempt was made to dispute the primacy of the Roman See in the Catholic Church; no effort to deprive the Pope of any really spiritual power, or to question his right to summon a general council, to define questions of faith; or to act as the centre of Catholic unity. No, the attack was of a very different kind.

On petition of the clergy, the temporal power passed certain acts, concerning Annates, Bulls, Appeals, and Dispensations.

The English Parliament, A.D. 1532, decreed that all first fruits, as annates, and other payments to the Roman See, for pensions and annuities, should cease. There was, surely, no schism, or heresy in the suppression of these taxes, which were of comparatively recent obligation, dating from the fourteenth century, and which, over and over again, have been suppressed in other national churches, like that of France, or of Austria. Pensions be-

gan to be fixed on benefices, by the popes, for the benefit of cardinals, and other members of the Roman court, about the time that the first-fruits device was invented; but it was idle to say that there was religious obligation to continue these exactions. The same law, which withdrew the annates from the grasp of the Pope, vested them in the King, and they remained part of the royal revenues, until the reign of Queen Anne, when they were restored to the Church, and appropriated for the augmentation of poor livings, under the designation "Queen Anne's Bounty."

It was also enacted, A.D. 1532, that there should be no more money paid for bulls, or papal letters of institution to bishoprics; and that, if these bulls were refused, the bishop-elect was to be consecrated in England, without them. In the following year the necessity of any bulls, briefs, or palls from Rome, was dispensed with, utterly.

This was a very righteous law. The necessity of papal bulls, was founded on the laws of the Roman pontiffs, collected by Gregory the 9th in the Decretals. It was a modern innovation, for as late as A.D. 1373, English bishops were confirmed, and ordained by their metropolitans, and not by papal bulls. The custom of obtaining bulls, for newly elected bishops, rose entirely from

the papal reservations, and usurpations of patronage, during the great Western schism, and they were continued afterwards, by concordats between sovereigns and the Roman See, who divided the plunder of the Church between them.

That these Bulls may be freely dispensed with, by the authority of national Churches, is an evident fact. The Synod of Ems, in Germany, A.D. 1785, declared that if the papacy refused to confirm the bishops, they would find resources in the ancient discipline.

The commission of cardinals, archbishops, and bishops, instituted by Napoleon, A.D. 1811, acknowledged that a National Council of France, could order that bishops should be instituted by the metropolitan, or senior bishop, instead of the Pope, in urgent circumstances. And when the Roman bishop refused to institute bishops in Portugal, the Portuguese applied to the Gallican Church, to intercede with the pontiff on their behalf, and, in case of failure, to consecrate their bishops. And, accordingly, the Gallican bishops intimated to the Roman bishop, that, in case of his continued refusal, they would supply his defect, and consecrate the Portuguese bishops.

The necessity of obtaining a pall from Rome, before metropolitan jurisdiction could be exer-

cised, was founded on the spurious decretals, to which Gregory 7th and the succeeding bishops of Rome appealed, in justification of their claims, on this point.

The pall was at first given to the Archbishop of Canterbury as a compliment, an external ensign of honor; and it conferred on him no greater power than he, and his predecessors, had always exercised. Only by its own consent, and permission, could this figment, regarding the necessity of the pall, exist in the National Church of England; and, when that permission was withdrawn, the claim went with it.

In the year 1532, it was enacted, that all causes concerning wills, matrimony, divorce, tithes, oblations, etc., should be determined within the realm of England, by the proper ecclesiastical tribunals; and that no appeals should be made to the bishop of Rome. Similar action had often been taken by National Churches.

The African Church prohibited, expressly, all appeals to Rome. The grand duke of Tuscany, and the King of Naples, prohibited appeals. In Austria, France, and Spain, no appeal was allowed, except for the purpose of procuring a rehearing of the case, within these countries; a very different thing from sending the case to a Roman

tribunal. The privilege of hearing appeals was a favor granted to the bishop of Rome which the National Church of England had a perfect right to withdraw at pleasure.

In the year 1533, it was also enacted that no one, in England, should hereafter sue to the bishop of Rome, for dispensations, and licenses. Originally, all bishops had granted these; but, from the tenth century onward, the right to do so had been gradually usurped by the Roman pontiffs; and the facility with which they were granted, for a pecuniary consideration, had told heavily against the discipline of the Church. The evils arising from this abuse afforded a sufficient reason for the limitation of the powers of dispensation to English bishops, who would naturally feel more deeply interested in the preservation of discipline among their own people, than the Roman Court, which viewed this power, chiefly as a means of supplying its pecuniary necessities. Papal dispensations have frequently been abolished by national churches; in Austria, for illustration.

These were the changes made by the Church of England, which caused the break with the Roman See. These measures made no change in the Faith, and interfered with no privilege, which belonged to the Roman See, either by primitive

custom, or by any grant of an Œcumenical Council.

The bishops, and clergy, of the two convocations, when the question was propounded to them, "Whether the bishop of Rome has in the Word of God any greater jurisdiction in the realm of England, than any other foreign bishop," determined that he had not. The Universities, the Chapters, the Convents of regulars, Mendicants, etc., also declared their assent, only one bishop, Fisher of Rochester, dissenting. All the branches of the jurisdiction, thus abolished, had risen, one by one, ages after the foundation of the Church of England, either by permission of that Church, or by deliberate usurpation; and there could be no obligation to continue these privileges to the Roman See longer than seemed expedient.

In assuming its national rights, our Mother Church did not, in fact, or in intention, separate itself from the Communion of the rest of the Catholic Church. It excommunicated no other Churches, and none of their clergy or people were ever refused Christian Communion, or intercourse, by the Church of England. It did not fail to recognize them as Churches of Christ and to acknowledge that it was the duty of Christians to remain united to them.

In the institution of a Christian man, A.D. 1537, approved by twenty-one archbishops and bishops of the Church of England, years after the papal jurisdiction had been abolished, the following passage is to be found: "I do believe that the Church of Rome is not, and cannot worthily be called, the Catholic Church, but only a particular member thereof; and cannot challenge, or vindicate of right, and by the Word of God, to be head of this Universal Church, or to have any authority over the other Churches of Christ, which be in England, France, Spain or any other realm. And I believe, also, that the said Church of Rome, with all the other particular Churches in the world, compacted, and united together, do make and constitute but one Catholic Church."

Again, A.D. 1543, in the "Necessary Doctrine" approved by the English bishops, all the other Western Churches are acknowledged, as parts of one Catholic Church; and the faithful in every country are exhorted to obey them.

It is obvious, therefore, that in asserting its independence of the usurpations of the Roman bishop, and in denying his right to meddle with English causes, or to plunder English Sees under forms of law, there was no desire to separate from the Communion of other Western Churches.

The origin of the Roman jurisdiction over particular Churches, was an unholy thing. Use was made of forgeries to establish this jurisdiction, and one usurpation of authority followed another, the aim being almost always a sordid one; to gratify avarice, or the lust of worldly power. The principle of obedience to the bishop of Rome as the test of Catholic unity, was a principle tending to schism. It divided the Western from the Eastern Churches, and separated the Church of England from the other National Churches of Europe.

But the act of separation was the work of the Roman bishop. Despising fraternal unity, he condemned the Church of England as schismatical and heretical, because it suppressed his jurisdiction, which he had either illegally usurped, or had received as a privilege, which of course could be withdrawn at pleasure. He, and those who sided with him, were guilty of the sin of schism, and he aggravated his sin by sending missionaries to England, to excite divisions in the Church, and withdraw the people from obedience to their pastors. He set up altar against altar, in this ancient Church, which once had been looked upon as a world beyond the sea, entitled to its own Cæsar, and to its own pontiff.

Pope Urban tells Archbishop Anselm that he is "Alterius orbis Apostolicum et Patriarchum;" or, to quote the words of William of Malesbury "Alterius orbis papam." And another writer designates Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, as "gentium trans-marinorum summus Pontifex." Into this ancient Church the Roman bishop sent his emissaries to encourage schism, and withdraw men from their obedience to the Catholic Church of England. And the sect thus formed, he recognized as the Church of Christ, and gave it bishops and pastors.

From the year 1533, when the papal jurisdiction was abolished, down to the eleventh year of the reign of Elizabeth, all people in England were subject to the same pastors, attended the same churches, and received the same sacraments. It was only about the year 1570, that the Romish party, instigated by foreign emissaries, separated itself, and fell from the communion of the Catholic Church of England.

Sir E. Coke, at the trial of the Jesuit Garnet, declared that until, in the eleventh year of her reign, the Queen was excommunicated, and deposed by the Pope, and all persons cursed who should obey her, there were no popish recusants in England; but thereupon, they refused to

assemble in our churches, not for conscience of anything there done, against which they might justly except out of God's Word, but because the Pope had excommunicated, and deposed the Queen, and cursed those who should obey her. The prisoner admitted, that most Catholics did indeed go to church before this date.

This separation from the Church, in the year 1570, was commented on, by all men, as a thing unprecedented, and strange. What shall we say of a society, thus formed, or of the instigator of this separation from the Church of Christ? The whole separation, or schism, was originated and effected by the Roman pontiffs, and their adherents. We did not go out from them, but, as the Apostle says, "They went out from us."

In asserting its independence, the national Church of England took its stand on the fact, that all bishops of Rome, when they are consecrated, and made bishops of that See, do make a solemn profession, and vow, that they will inviolably observe, and keep, all the ordinances made in the first eight general councils; among which it is specially provided, and enacted, that all causes shall be finished, and determined within the province where the same be begun, and that by the bishops of the same province; and that no bishop shall

exercise jurisdiction out of his own diocese or province.

When, presently, the Church followed its assertion of independence in its own internal affairs, by taking order with regard to rites and ceremonies, and in defining doctrine, and questions of faith and worship, its aim was to regain for the English nation, the pure and practical elements of the Faith which in the middle ages had been obscured, distorted, or denied, by the dominant class of schoolmen.

To quote the words of a memorable document, of that age: "This pure doctrine of the gospel, which we have embraced, is without doubt, the very consent of the Catholic Church of Christ, as the testimonies of the old Church, and of the holy fathers, do evidently declare. For we do not receive, or approve, any wicked opinions, or such as fight against the consent of the holy fathers. Yea, rather, in many articles we do renew the teachings of the old synods, and fathers, which the latter age had put out of the way, and for them had given forth other false and counterfeit doctrines, with the which our adversaries do shamefully fight, with the judgments of the fathers, and authority of the Synods."

In using the term "National Church," we must

remember that it by no means implies, that the boundaries of a civil government shall necessarily limit the jurisdiction of a National or provincial church. Sometimes an independent provincial church has only included one or two provinces of an Empire, sometimes, it seems to have included two or three countries, practically independent of each other in civil affairs.

In speaking of the National Churches of Europe, the Necessary Doctrine goes on to mention some of the particulars which render independence necessary. These are: "distance of place," "diversity of traditions," "not in all things unity of opinions," "alteration of rites, ceremonies, and ordinances, or estimation of the same, as one church doth, peradventure, esteem their rites, traditions, laws, ordinances, and ceremonies to be of more force, and efficacy, than another church doth esteem the same."

It is added, that "these particular churches, with local diversities, are members of the whole Catholic Church, and each, by itself, worthy to be called a Catholic Church, when it professes, and teaches the faith and religion of Christ according to Scripture, and the Apostolic doctrine. And so every Christian man ought to honor, give credence,

and follow the particular Church, of that region wherein he is born, or inhabited."

It follows, therefore, that where there is practical unanimity in the traditions, opinions, rites, ceremonies, and ordinances, or estimation of the same, and where distance of place does not prevent, particular churches may be united in one province, irrespective of civil divisions. The genius of a people, its ideals, its civilization, its ambitions, have a great deal to do, in determining the boundaries of provincial churches.

The Spanish and Gallican Churches, ministering to portions of the Latin race, could easily unite, as they have done in the past. But the Gallican and German Churches were compelled, by race differences, to follow different paths. And where a people is essentially one, in all that goes to make up its civilization, although it may exist under several independent civil governments, it should, as a Church, be one.

It seems intolerable that the unity of a national Church, should be dependent on the freaks of politics. When civil war broke out in our country, was the American Church divided? When peace came, did two independent national Churches again become one? It seems to me, that a truer interpretation of facts would insist that the

Church remained one, no matter how terrible might be the disruption of the state.

Or, again: Canada is part of the British Empire, but practically it is an independent country, completely controlling its own affairs, and levying taxes on Commerce from Great Britain, as really as if it were imported from Russia. But, in a very real sense, the Canadian Church is a portion of the great Anglican Communion, independent in its own affairs, yet preserving an absolute identity of traditions, opinions, rites, ceremonies, and ordinances, with the Church of England; and sharing in all the missionary activities of that great Communion. The same may be said of the Church in Australia, South Africa, and other portions of the world.

Wherever our Anglo-Saxon civilization has penetrated, we find substantially the same communities of men, with the same ambitions, the same ideals, the same rules of morality, the same passion for freedom and righteousness, the same scorn of tyranny, the same reverence for law. And everywhere, our National Church, which asserted its rights to its ancient liberties in the Sixteenth Century, is to be found, with identity of traditions, opinions, rites, ceremonies, and ordinances.

Ought we not to recognize that fact, and act on it more freely? The civil lines that separate one portion of our race from another, are growing fainter, and possibly under the influence of a more enlightened civilization will practically disappear; so that, wherever the English-speaking race is to be found, it will, to all intents and purposes, be one; and the barriers that have separated the great family, will be flung on the dust heaps of the barbarisms of the past.

Ought not the Church of the English-speaking race to anticipate, and show the way, to that union of hearts, by a closer organic union, which shall enable it to concentrate its energies more effectually, in its warfare with evil, and in its effort to extend the Kingdom of Christ throughout the habitable earth? Why should not the Church in Canada, and in the United States be one, with one general Convention, or Synod, one House of Bishops, one field of missionary activity, controlled by one policy?

And, from such a beginning, organic union, disregarding mere civil lines, might grow, until our whole communion, under the primacy of Canterbury, could be gathered in one great provincial, or national Church.

Think what it would be, if all the missionary

work of the Anglican Communion throughout the world were our mission work; if all our sympathies could be quickened by the consciousness, that, wherever our race was represented, there the whole Church was represented, with all the power of our great Communion behind it, to animate its zeal, and stimulate its effort, and, with the steady guidance of the voice of the Church, to preserve the traditions, and the opinions, rites, ceremonies, and ordinances of the National Church.

How much wider our sympathies would be, if, not only in theory, but in practice, the mandates of the Church, and the field of its labor, were not limited by the mutations of worldly politics! Necessarily, the National Church must be limited to the English-speaking people, throughout the world, and those whom they have assimilated, so that they have become one with them, in their civilization, and their ideals.

Other races of men require a particular church, with rites, traditions, laws, ordinances, and ceremonies that would not commend themselves to the English-speaking people. So long as they profess, and teach the faith and religion of Christ, according to Scripture and the Apostolic doctrine, the

Church of the great Anglican Communion has for them only words of affectionate benediction.

“In these our doings, we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only. For we think it convenient, that every country should use such ceremonies, as they shall think best, to the setting forth of God’s honor and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition; and that they should put away other things, which from time to time, they perceive to be most abused, as in men’s ordinances it often chanceth, diversely, in diverse countries.” Instead of “country,” read “race,” and this quotation, from the preface of the English Prayer Book, is the best solution of the difficult question of evangelizing the world.

The Negro, or the Japanese, or the Hindoo cannot, at least for a long time to come, become one with the English-speaking race. The modes of thought, the temperament, the ideals, of these races differentiate them from us; so that, to expect that our worship could become naturalized among them, is absurd. We cannot make them Prayer Book Churchmen. But, under God’s blessing, we can help them to form a particular Church for their race, which, while holding fast to Catholic Faith,

and order, on the one hand, shall, on the other, adopt and create such traditions, opinions, rites, ceremonies, and ordinances, as will express most fully, the spirit of devout worship, and obedience to the Law of Christ.

Wherever that particular Church, say of the Japanese, is represented, whether in the islands of the far Pacific, or in some colony, possibly in the West Indies, or in South America, why should it not be considered the one national Japanese Church? No matter in how many civil divisions of the globe it may exist.

It is the same oneness, that we would wish for the Anglican Church, over all the world, with provincial government, which would guide its onward movement, and preserve inviolate everywhere, our faith, and order. Nothing would so powerfully tend to restore the discipline of the Church, and give such articulate voice, to its authoritative utterance.

It becomes Churchmen to guard with reverent and loyal love the rights and liberties of our National Church. In a divided Christendom our Church is the one possible rallying place, of those who long, and pray for the reunion of the family of Christ. The full heritage of the Catholic Church is our possession.

Our faith is the faith once delivered to the saints. Our orders are those of the Apostles. Our tradition is that of absolute loyalty to the teaching of the fathers, and obedience to the Canons of the ancient councils.

We have not separated from our brethren, however ready they may have been to go out from us. We have not added to the Catholic Creed, a series of Articles, which must first be renounced, before we can seriously ask others to unite with us. But, standing fast in the old paths, as an independent National Church, we wait, with confidence, the day when all men will also come to this common heritage of the faith, which we have never deserted.

As Churchmen we have our duty to perform, and must not shrink from it. On what terms may other men come to our Communion? It is an inquiry which has not received an adequate answer. But there should be a solemn rite by which men may be received, who come to us from other religious bodies. They have, let us suppose, been baptized with water, "in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"; and therefore may be presumed to stand in the same relation to the Church, as persons who have received clinical baptism from our own clergy. Charity could

not go any farther than that. Such persons we know are required publicly to confess the vows of Holy baptism, and are solemnly received into the Church; and I think that the same confession, and public reception, should mark the admission of every soul that comes to our Communion, from other religious bodies.

All such persons should be reconciled to the Church also, by the rite of Confirmation. Of course, when members of the various evangelical denominations, as they are ordinarily designated, have been received into the Church, their confirmation is a necessity, as they have never received the Apostolic rite; but when persons come to us from the Roman Communion, or in the remote contingency, of their coming to us from the Greek Communion; is it sufficient, solemnly to receive them into the Church, and admit them to the Holy Communion, or should they be Confirmed afresh? It seems to me that they must receive the rite of Confirmation.

Our National Church is the guardian of the truth, and it is pledged to be loyal to it, under all circumstances. It stands by the ancient tradition of the Church, and reverently obeys the Word of God. From the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we derive our authority for the *Form* of

Confirmation. The text reads: "Then laid they their hands on them and they received the Holy Ghost." And again: "When Simon saw that through the laying on of the Apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given." The divinely appointed ritual act, by which the seven-fold Spirit is imparted, is the *Laying on of Apostolic Hands*.

But this Apostolic ordinance has been practically disregarded, in both the Greek and Roman Communions, and the ceremony of anointing has been substituted for it. Originally, the anointing was part of the ceremony attending the administration of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. There was an anointing of the candidate before the administration of the Sacrament, and an anointing afterwards.

In the Roman Office of Baptism we find traces of these ancient ceremonies. The infant, before it is baptized, is to be anointed on the breast, and between the shoulders with the "*Oleum Catechumenorum*;" and, after baptism, it is anointed again with the Chrism "*in sumitate capitis, in modum crucis*." It was this second anointing, which in the course of time, became attached to the rite of Confirmation, and presently was substituted for it. When the corruption took place we cannot say.

In the Eastern Church, it had become firmly established in the age of St. Cyril, who, in his catechetical lectures, mentions the mysteries in the following order: Baptism, the Chrism, the first Communion. He has nothing to say about the Laying on of Hands, but describes the Eastern mode of Confirmation in these words: "The ointment is applied to the forehead, ears, nostrils, mouth, and breast, implying that the soul is sanctified by the holy and life-giving Spirit." The Bishop is to consecrate the Chrism, but it may be applied by a priest. Substantially, this is the present form of Confirmation in the Eastern Church.

In the Roman Pontifical, there are three offices of Confirmation. There is the ancient office, in which the Confirmation is said to be effected by the application of the Chrism. "Signo te signo Crucis, et confirmo te, chrismate salutis in Nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti;" and in the appendix there are two Offices of Confirmation, in which the rubric allows for a sort of stealthy or surreptitious laying on of hands, probably inserted here, as a sort of answer to criticism.

The rubric says, that when the Bishop confirms, saying: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and confirm thee with the chrism of Salva-

tion, in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," he is to lay his right hand on the head of the person he is confirming, and with his thumb anointed with chrism, makes the sign of the cross on his forehead. Can we condone this substitution of an unauthorized rite, for the Scriptural ordinance of the Laying on of Hands, and call it Confirmation?

In the Eastern Church, the oil has become so completely the confirming instrument, that a Bishop is only needed to consecrate it. It can be carried anywhere, and applied by a priest. No one pretends that a priest has any Apostolic authority to confirm, so that the Confirmation depends altogether, on the Chrism, and not on the orders of the person administering it.

But it is not so with the Laying on of Hands. When Simon Magus desired to have the power to confirm, he did not offer money for a flask of Chrism, but he said: "Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost." The Roman rite of Confirmation does not seem any more justifiable than the Eastern rite, from which the Laying on of Hands has been completely eliminated. For the Roman rite solemnly declares that the Chrism is the instrument of Confirmation. "Confirmo te Chrismate

Salutis." There is a sort of stealthy laying on of hands by the Roman bishop, provided for, in the service, in the Appendix of the Pontifical.

But we have no business to attach any more importance to it, than the Roman Church does. It does not attach any virtue, or significance to it whatever. But it deliberately declares, that the application of the consecrated oil, is the confirming act.

What, then, is the duty of the Apostolic Church, when persons thus Confirmed, seek admission to its Communion? If fidelity to the teaching of Holy Scripture is a primary obligation, I do not see how we can justify a confirmation which does not profess to be effected at all, by the Laying on of Hands, but by the application of Chrism. It certainly must be doubtful to say the least, and therefore, in charity the Church should bestow an undoubtedly valid Confirmation on those coming to its communion, who have received this defective rite.

It was only very gradually that the unscriptural anointing usurped the place of the Laying on of Hands in the Western Church. Cyprian does not mention it at all in his description of Confirmation. With him, Confirmation meant the imposition of Hands. Even as late as A.D. 441, the

first Council of Orange ordered that Chrism should not be administered at Confirmation, unless, from some necessary cause, it had been omitted at baptism. Centuries later, Alcuin describes Confirmation, mentions only the Laying on of Hands, and says nothing about any anointing with Chrism. “Novissime, per impositionem manus a summo sacerdote, septiformis gratiae Spiritum accepit.”

But in the case of Romanists seeking admission to our Communion, Confirmation must be administered, not only to supply a rite which is defective, but for the further reason, that they come from a Communion which is schismatical, and heretical.

In the year 1570, the Bishop of Rome excommunicated and deposed, so far as he could, Queen Elizabeth, and cursed all who should yield obedience to her. Thus he encouraged a party to separate from the Catholic Church of England; a separation which is spoken of, by all writers at that time, as novel and unprecedented; and to this sect he sent missionaries, and vicars-apostolic, to withdraw the people from allegiance to their legitimate pastors. He, and those who followed him, separated from us.

As I have shown, the Catholic Church of England never separated itself from the rest of

Christendom, or refused fraternal recognition of other Churches. We did not go out from them, but they went out from us. They have committed the sin of schism. And when the schismatic returns to the Church, he must be formally reconciled to it.

Again, the Church of Rome has been guilty of heresy. Heresy is not only the denial of the Faith; it means, also, adding to the Faith unwarrantable and false dogmas. This was the sin of those false teachers, who had perverted the Galatian Church, and whom St. Paul visits with the extreme sentence of excommunication. In addition to the Christian Faith, they had added certain requirements of the Mosaic law, such as Circumcision, as necessary to salvation. "Except ye be circumcised ye cannot be saved."

The Church has, in General Councils, set forth the Nicene Creed as the true confession of Faith. To this Faith, Rome added the so-called Creed of Pope Pius IV., A.D. 1564, in which the belief in the seven sacraments, in transubstantiation, in purgatory, in the veneration of saints and images, in indulgences, in the Roman Church as the Mother of Churches, and in the bishop of Rome, as the successor of Peter, and the vicar of Christ; and the acceptance of all the definitions of the Council of

Trent is pronounced the true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved. To these particulars, there has been added, the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception, and of the Papal Infallibility.

If, when the Judaising teachers added to the Faith the requirement of circumcision, as necessary to salvation, St. Paul counted them accursed, we cannot hesitate to brand as heretical, those false teachings which the Roman Church has fastened on the Creed, as necessary to salvation.

And when Romanists seek admission to our Communion, it is necessary that they should be reconciled to the Church, by that solemn rite by which the Catholic Church has, from ancient days, always reconciled the schismatic and the heretic; that is to say by Confirmation.

We stand by the principles of the ancient undivided Catholic Church: When penitents returned to the Church, from heretical, or schismatical bodies, if their baptism was formally complete, it was recognized as valid. The orders of their bishops, priests, and deacons, also were recognized; but their confirmation was regarded as null and void, and they were invariably re-confirmed.

It is admitted that the heretic and schismatic were, in ancient times reconciled to the Church by

the Laying on of Hands; but it has been often taken for granted, that this was a sort of benediction, or a penitential ceremony, and not Confirmation. But antiquity does not offer a shred of evidence for any such theory. In the anonymous treatise, on the re-baptism of heretics, written by some ecclesiastic attached to Stephen, bishop of Rome, at the time of his contest with Cyprian, and in several of the epistles of Cyprian, the reconciling of heretics by the Laying on of Hands is mentioned, again and again, and the ceremony is treated as identical with the confirmation administered by the Apostles to the Samaritans.

Sixty years after Cyprian's death, the Council of Arles orders that heretics, returning to the Church, should be reconciled by the imposition of hands, that they might receive the Holy Spirit. Siricius, bishop of Rome, writes, A.D. 384, that converts from Arianism are not to be re-baptized, but attached to the Catholic Communion, by means of the invocation of the Holy Spirit only, by imposition of the bishop's hand. Pope Innocent, A.D. 415, says, Arians are to be received into the Church, by imposition of hands to give them the Spirit. St. Augustine says that the Laying on of Hands is not, like baptism, incapable of repetition, and insists that heretics must thus be reconciled to

the Church. Jerome, in his dialogue with the Luciferian, also declares that the heretics are to be received with the Laying on of Hands, and identifies the rite with the gift conferred by the Apostles on the Samaritans.

About this time, the Chrism began to be widely recognized in the Western Church as part of the Confirmation rite, and so the first Council of Orange, the second Council of Arles, and the Council of Epone declare, that heretics must be reconciled with the Chrism, and the Laying on of Hands.

We see, then, that in the Western Church, in ancient days the penitent, coming from heresy, or schism, was invariably reconciled by the rite of Confirmation. The practice of the Eastern Church was the same. The seventh Canon of the second General Council, held in Constantinople, A.D. 381, directs that heretics, whose baptism is valid, are to be reconciled to the Church, with the precise ritual, acts and words of Confirmation. They are to be anointed on the forehead, eyes, nostrils, mouth, and ears, with the Chrism, the officiant saying, "The seal of the Holy Spirit." The Council of Laodicea, Canon seven, declares that heretics are to be anointed with the Chrism, and then admitted to the Holy Communion. St.

Basil, and the pseudo Justin Martyr, give the same directions, and the Quinisext Council reaffirms the decree, of the Second General Council, which I have already quoted.

Further testimony is unnecessary, as these voices are final and authoritative. Looking over the history of the Catholic Church from the age of Cyprian, to the sixth century, I cannot find, anywhere, any difference mentioned between Confirmation and the rite by which penitents were reconciled to the Church. Over, and over again, writers compare the rite, by which the heretic was admitted to the Communion, with the two cases of Confirmation mentioned in the Acts of the Holy Apostles.

There is a wide spread notion, that the penitential laying on of hands, by which the heretic was reconciled, was not Confirmation. The early church knew no such distinction. It was the invention of some obscure interpolator. It is first to be found in a letter purposing to have been sent by Pope Vigilius, A.D. 538, to Himerius. This letter speaks of the reconciliation of heretics, and in it we find this sentence: "Their reconciliation is not effected by means of that imposition of the hand, which takes place through invocation of the Holy Ghost, but by means of that imposition, by

which the fruit of penitence is acquired, and the restoration to the Holy Communion is performed." The letter is a discredited document. It exists in more than one form, and has been largely interpolated in the interest of the Roman See, and the sentence I have quoted is one of these interpolations. Like many other Roman novelties, it contradicts the teaching of Cyprian, of Augustine, of Jerome, of the early councils, of the early bishops of the Roman See itself, all of whom expressly declare, that the imposition of hands is administered to the penitent heretic, for the express purpose of conveying the seven-fold gifts of the Spirit.

It seems to me, therefore, that the Anglican Communion, as the guardian of Catholic tradition, and the witness of the truth, has only one course open to it, when those who have been brought up in the Roman Church, seek admission to our fold. Whereas the rite of Confirmation which they have received is so unscriptural, and defective as to be of doubtful validity, and whereas they come to us from a Communion which has separated from us, and is, therefore, guilty of schism, and which has added to the Creed false and unwarranted articles of faith, it is our duty to receive all such penitents with the rite of Confirmation, in accordance with the ancient tradition of the Catholic Church.

The independence of National Churches is one of our fundamental principles. It seems to me that often we have a very inadequate conception of the grandeur of our spiritual inheritance. Our attitude is apologetic as if our venerable Communion needed many excuses for its shortcomings.

We need apologies, indeed, because we are so unworthy of our spiritual birth-right; but the great Church of which we are such unworthy members, has nothing to take back, nothing to apologize for, nothing to be ashamed of.

It has been the faithful keeper, and witness of the Word of God, and has ministered the Sacred Scriptures to the whole English-speaking race throughout the world, which receives, and reads the Word of God, everywhere, as this Church hath interpreted it.

It has kept inviolate the Creeds of the Church, neither mutilating, nor interpolating the symbol handed down from ancient days; it has loyally followed and submitted to the ancient traditions and Canons of the Catholic Church, and has generously striven, under great provocation, to follow peace with all men, and to seek the re-union, of all who profess and call themselves Christians in one holy Catholic Church.

It has reverently preserved and obeyed the

Apostolic ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons, and with a willing mind has sent forth that ministry to the ends of the earth, that the nations may, by its labors, be gathered into the flock of Christ. And it has stood in the evil day, and having suffered many things, it still stands, in its national independence, the one great bulwark against spiritual oppression, and moral corruption, the one steadfast witness of Apostolic order, of Catholic tradition, of evangelical truth.

It is, to-day, the one steadfast representative of the Catholic Church. It occupies the homestead, and to its position other men must come, from the East and the West, when the hour of re-union shall arrive.

If our Church desired to base its authority on fables, it would be an easy matter for some master of romance, to invent for it a body of Pauline claims which would offset the Petrine claims with which Rome has so successfully conjured in the past.

There is more contemporary evidence to show that St. Paul had the primacy of the whole Gentile world, and that he founded the British Church, than there is for the assertion that Peter ever visited Rome. Not a word in the account of his life, or in his writings, nor in the letters that St.

Paul wrote at Rome, nor in the letter he wrote to the Romans, ever hints that Peter was within a thousand miles of the Imperial City. The Apostle had been dead more than one hundred years before anyone mentioned, so far as we know, that he had visited Rome. And one hundred years is a long time. Many a story with no basis of fact could be invented in that space of time.

All the Apostles sleep in obscure graves; the time of their departure was not a relic-worshipping age. Christians were living in constant anticipation of the coming of Christ. In their estimation, it mattered little where the saints might be sleeping. It was only for a little while. In a few days, in a year or two at most, the Resurrection would occur. Hence no pains were taken to remember or commemorate the death of the Apostles.

Some time about the middle of the second century, an Ebionite Jew, the writer of the Clementine forgeries, invented the story of Peter's visit to Rome, and in the course of a few centuries the minute details of his life there for twenty-five years, were elaborated, many of which would be a great surprise to Peter if he were to come back to us from his unknown grave in Mesopotamia.

I have often thought what an opportunity for the writer of the marvellous was lost, when the

Primacy of St. Paul was not exploited! He had an Apostolic commission beyond any question, that included all the Gentiles. While the rest of the Apostles were to confine themselves to those of the circumcision, to him was committed a universal episcopate including all the nations. It was, we know, from his own confession, the ardent desire of the Apostle not only to visit Rome, but to carry the Gospel to those unknown western regions where the power of the empire was slowly extending.

We have the testimony of Clement, that after his first imprisonment at Rome, he penetrated to the utmost bounds of the West, an expression which probably refers to Great Britain. It is possible that it was he who founded the Church in Great Britain, and the great Cathedral in London dedicated to his blessed memory may also mark the seat of the only episcopate which has any positive Oecumenical authority. But our Church rests its claims on no shadowy and superstitious figments. It stands for the Christian liberty of the whole family of Christ, and asserts the independence of national Churches.

It is a curious fact that the Roman Church virtually asserts the same principle. It sees that a majority of the cardinals shall always be Italians, so that the rights of that national Church shall at

all events be secured. But if one may read the signs of the times, it is God's will that our national Church should be the spiritual heir of that Apostolic heritage committed to St. Paul. The day of the Latin race has passed away. The ghost of the old heathen empire, which has so long sat by the Tiber asserting claims to universal empire is fading out.

And it seems to be God's will that the leadership of the world should pass to the English-speaking people. Already one fourth of the inhabitants of the world are subject to its influence, and daily that influence is extending. Under God's providence, the course of human events is tending to fuse the English-speaking people into one great brotherhood, animated everywhere by the same ambitions, cherishing the same aims, and holding in common the same traditions and sympathies.

And surely it is God's will that the Church of the English-speaking race, which has given it the Bible, which has educated it until it is the foremost of the nations, has before it a grand future, whose possibilities of usefulness and beneficence are unbounded. If it can gather together the scattered sheep in one fold, if it can raise up the standard of truth, so that all who love our Lord shall flock together, and if it can show the way where the hosts

of the Redeemer can follow, to win new conquests for the Prince of Peace, how blessed shall be its mission!

It can surely do so if the men who serve it to-day will respond to the grandeur of their birth-right. The Church needs men valiant, loyal, and obedient, to do its bidding. Its sons should be true men, knowing that they serve the Catholic Church. Its peace should be the deepest desire of their heart, and its authority their final and conclusive rule. Its rites and ceremonies must be their standard of ritual. It has all authority, and can change them at will. What it orders, therefore, what its custom or tradition may be, is the rule for the loyal.

It is the Keeper of the truth; and its interpretation of truth, its Creeds, its Orders, its Sacraments, are to its loyal sons the messages of God. All the pettiness of those internal conflicts about ritual, or minor points of doctrine, which divide men into schools, and turn their energies against each other, should be shamed into silence. In an army on the march against the foe, the soldier is a traitor who creates dissension among his comrades in the ranks.

But the Church is more than an army. It is a family, and the chivalrous tenderness, the rever-

ence, the obedience, of sons serving their mother, should mark the attitude of the sons of the Church. Hugh James Rose rebuked John Henry Newman for his lack of that spirit ten years before the man became an apostate. His lack of the spirit of loyalty and love for the Church, his unfilial temper, was the beginning of his perversion.

Our blessed Master has left us an example. The Good Shepherd layeth down His life for the sheep, but the hireling fleeth because he is an hireling. Selfishness is his animating principle, and his thought is self, and not the Church. Christ loved the Church, and gave Himself for it.

If in this respect we can follow our Master even afar off, then the boundless opportunities which God has set before the National Church of the Anglican Communion will be seized, and the blessings it is empowered to bestow on the world as the pillar and ground of the truth, as the steadfast witness of Apostolic tradition and of Christian liberty, and as the rallying place, where men may meet and find unity and liberty, will be made so manifest that everywhere the seekers after truth will exclaim, "We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you."

APPENDIX.

The Re-confirmation of Romanists

Seeking Admission to our Communion.

*A Letter to the Rt. Rev. Wm. Croswell Doane,
D.D., Bishop of Albany.*

[PUBLISHED BY REQUEST OF THE BISHOP.]

Rt. Rev. and dear Bishop:

IN your Pastoral Letter, entitled "The Service of Preaching and the Preaching of the Service," you deal briefly with the question of the Confirmation of Romanists seeking admission to our Communion. The question of the validity of the Roman rite of Confirmation you decide, without hesitation, in the affirmative, the objections to its form being, in your judgment, without weight, like the objections of the immersionist to the valid-

ity of Baptism by affusion. The other phase of the question, the reconciliation of heretics and schismatics, you speak about with hesitation. You say, "If any body needs purging and reconciling from the sins of heresy and schism, it is the Roman Catholic returning to Catholicity." But while admitting that the Romanist is in heresy, you are inclined to view the Catholic Rite of Laying on of Hands, by which the heretic is reconciled to the Church, as an act of Benediction, and not Confirmation. You add, that the responsibility of presenting persons for Confirmation rests with the priest, and that, unless the case is specially referred to you, you would not feel justified in refusing to confirm a Romanist convert if presented.

It has always been my practice to present converts from Romanism for Confirmation, and my scruples on this point have invariably been treated by you with kindly forbearance. I have known that you were clearly of the opinion that the Roman Rite of Confirmation was valid, and I was also aware that you declined, for the present, until you had had leisure to examine the question more thoroughly, to pronounce on the nature of the Laying on of Hands by which the heretic is reconciled to the Church. In setting forth, therefore, as briefly as I can, the grounds on which I have ever

held that the re-Confirmation of heretics is the custom of the Catholic Church, I disclaim that I have any controversy with my Bishop on this grave subject, except so far as I call in question the validity of the Roman rite.

This is a minor issue, and in my argument for the re-Confirmation of Romanists, I shall assume that the form of the Roman rite is valid. But before proceeding to the main issue, I must state why I call in question the sufficiency and validity of the Roman rite.

From the 8th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we derive our authority for the form of Confirmation. The text reads, "Then laid they their hands on them and they received the Holy Ghost." And again, "When Simon saw that through laying on of the Apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given."

The Divinely ordered ritual act by which the seven-fold Spirit is imparted is the Laying on of Apostolic Hands. But the Roman Rite distinctly states that the Confirmation is effected, not by the Laying on of Hands, but by the application of the Chrism. "Confirmo te Chrismate salutis." In the Roman Pontifical there are three Offices of Confirmation. There is the ancient Office, where the rubric calls only for the application of the

Chrism with the thumb, “Signo te signo crucis (*quod dum dicit, producit pollice signum crucis in frontem illius*) et confirmo te Chrismate salutis in Nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti;” and two Offices in the Appendix, added because of the criticisms of the adversaries of Rome, where the rubric provides for a sort of surreptitious Laying on of the Hand at the time of the application of the Chrism. The text repeated by the Bishop is the same as I have quoted from the ancient Office, but the rubric reads, “Et dum hoc dicit, imposita eadem manu dextera super caput confirmandi, producit pollice signum crucis in frontem illius.” This direction provides that the Bishop shall lay his hand on the head while signing, with his thumb anointed with Chrism, the forehead of the candidate for Confirmation. But here, also, the Confirmation is declared in the most solemn manner to be effected by the Chrism: “I confirm thee with the Chrism of Salvation in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” How far are we justified in condoning this flagrant substitution of an unauthorized rite for the Spiritual Ordinance of the Laying on of Hands? One can see how far the mischief can go, when he remembers that in the Eastern Church the oil has become the confirming

instrument so completely, that a Bishop is only needed to consecrate the Chrism. It can be carried anywhere and applied by a priest. No one among us holds that the priest has any Apostolic authority to confirm, so that the Confirmation depends altogether on the Chrism, not on the person administering it. But that is not the Laying on of Hands. When Simon Magus desired to possess the power of confirming, he did not seek to purchase a flask of Chrism, but he said: "Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands he may receive the Holy Ghost." And is the Roman rite of Confirmation, which solemnly asserts that the Chrism is the confirming agency, any more justifiable than this Eastern rite from which the Laying on of Hands has been altogether eliminated? It may be urged that there is contact of the hand of the Bishop with the head of the candidate at the time Chrism is administered, but can the Episcopal hand do that thing which at the same moment the Bishop distinctly and solemnly affirms to be done by another agency, "Confirmo te Chrismate Salutis"? I think not. It seems to me we have no right to attach to that Laying on of Hands any more importance than the Roman Church does itself. There is nothing in the Office of Confirmation as given in the Roman Pontifical to show that

the act has any virtue or significance. Unless, then, whenever a Bishop lays his hand on a child's head, the act has the virtue of Confirmation, it is difficult to see on what grounds we can say that in the Roman Rite the Laying on of Hands is given. It is to be remembered that in the ancient rite, in the beginning of the Pontifical there is no provision for any Laying on of the Hand whatever, and the stealthy Laying on of the Hand provided for in the Office of the Appendix, although the Chrism is still declared to be the sole confirming agency, seems to me an unworthy subterfuge that should not be condoned. It is as if some one had been pretending to baptize by putting his hand on a child's head, and when taxed with the crime had tried to justify himself by saying that his hand was damp when he performed the ceremony, and therefore the baptism was valid.

It is not a question of putting a hand, or hands, on the head of the candidate, but rather, whether we can justify a Confirmation which does not profess to be done by the Laying on of Hands at all, but by application of the Chrism.

It seems to me, that before charity for the Roman usage, we must place fidelity to the Rite, as authorized in Holy Scripture; and that certainly demands that the Office of Confirmation, to be

valid, must clearly show the intention to impart the gift which the Apostles gave to the Samaritans by the same means that they used—the Laying on of Hands.

I must demur to the comparison of my objection to the Roman Rite, to the criticism of the immersionist against baptism by affusion. The latter is evidently administered with *water*, and when the Roman Rite of Confirmation is so far amended that it shall be plain the gift is conveyed not by application of Chrism, but by the Laying on of Hands, I will cheerfully acknowledge its validity.

But allowing for the sake of discussion that the Roman Rite for Confirmation is valid, it does not remove the necessity for re-confirming the Romanist seeking admission to our Communion. For the Roman Church is in heresy, and it is the Catholic custom to reconcile the heretic by Confirmation. We all admit that the heretic was received into the Church by the Laying on of Hands, but it is some times denied that this ceremony was Confirmation. It is said to have been a different thing, a Benediction or a penitential Laying on of Hands, but at all events, not Confirmation. The plain evidence of antiquity will not justify this assertion. For centuries the notion was never

entertained in the Church ; and, unfortunately for the theory, the first attempt to differentiate from Confirmation, the Laying on of Hands by which heretics were reconciled to the Church, is to be found in an Epistle pretending to be from Vigilius, Bishop of Rome, A.D., 538, a fraudulent, discredited document, which has been largely interpolated in the interests of the Roman See. To go into all the evidence bearing on this subject would far exceed the limits of my time and your patience ; it will be sufficient to refer to a few illustrations from history, which clearly exhibit the custom of the Catholic Church, and which, I think, plainly bear out my contention. If I am in error in the interpretation of these facts I certainly find myself in very good company.

The learned Bingham, in his treatise on Baptism, devotes a large space to the confirmation of heretics, without a thought in his mind that the ceremony by which these persons were reconciled to the Church, was not Confirmation at all.

In Smith's Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, under the article "Confirmation" we read : "A special aspect of Confirmation presents itself in connection with the reception into the Church, of those who had been baptized by heretics. Baptism, if formally complete, was recognized as

valid, but the case was otherwise with the Laying on of Hands. Only in the Catholic Church could the gifts of the Spirit be imparted, and so, even if the heretical sect had its Bishops, and they administered the Rite, it was regarded as null and void. When those, who had been members of such a community, returned to the Church, Confirmation, including the anointing, as well as the Laying on of Hands, became the formal act of admission." The writer of the article is E. H. Plumptre, no mean authority in the province of historical criticism.

Dr. Harold Browne in his work on the Articles of Religion, commenting on Art. XXV. says: "The separation of Baptism from Confirmation rose sometimes from the Confirmation of heretics, who were confirmed but not re-baptized." I might add many similar testimonies from learned men, and the writings of the Fathers seem to me to admit of no other conclusion.

In seeking to discover what was the usage of the Catholic Church regarding the reception of heretics, I would go back to the contest between Cyprian and Stephen, Bishop of Rome. As is well known, Cyprian contended that heretics returning to the Church must be re-baptized, while Stephen insisted that the ancient custom of the

Church was to accept the Baptism if formally complete, and to reconcile the heretic by the Laying on of Hands. What was this ceremony understood to be? Was it Confirmation or something else? I shall prove that both Cyprian and his opponents looked upon it as identical with the Rite which the Apostles administered to the Samaritans whom Philip had baptized, and the Rite which St. Paul bestowed on the men of Ephesus after they had received Christian Baptism. The anonymous treatise on the "Re-baptism of Heretics" (written, Canon Mason concludes, by one of the prelates in the entourage of Stephen) represents the views of the Roman party. We will therefore, first examine its statements. In the first section it states the question under discussion in these words: "The point is whether, according to the most ancient custom and ecclesiastical tradition, it would suffice, after that Baptism which they have received outside the Church indeed, but still in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord, that only hands should be laid upon them by the Bishop for their reception of the Holy Spirit, and this Imposition of Hands would afford them the renewed and perfected seal of faith: or whether, indeed a repetition of Baptism would be necessary for them, just as if they were never baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ."

What did this man understand by the Laying on of Hands mentioned above? Can the Rite to which he refers be anything else than Confirmation? Is not the seven-fold Spirit the Confirmation gift?

And the purpose of the Laying on of Hands he says, by which the heretics were reconciled according to the ancient custom of the Church was "for their reception of the Holy Spirit." In section 10 the writer contends that Confirmation outside the Church is impossible. "Outside the Church there is no Holy Spirit, sound faith moreover cannot exist, not alone among heretics, but even among those who are established in schism. And for that reason they who repent and are amended by the doctrine of the truth ought to be aided only by spiritual Baptism, that is, by Imposition of the Bishop's Hands, and by ministration of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, the perfect seal of faith has been rightly accustomed to be given in this manner, and on this principle in the Church."

Now if we refer to the Confirmation mentioned in the 8th Chap. of Acts, why did the Apostles go to Samaria? Was it not that they might confer a gift on the converts of Philip, which they could not otherwise receive? The Holy Ghost had fallen on none of them. And later on we read that the Apostles laid their hands on them and

they received the Holy Ghost. The statement of the writer on the re-baptism of heretics is, that outside the Church there is no Holy Spirit, and that a penitent returning to the Church is to be reconciled by Imposition of the Bishop's Hands, and by the ministration of the Holy Spirit.

In what respect do the Rites differ? In either case it is ministered to men who do not possess the seven-fold Spirit, the Confirmation gift. The Rite in each case is a Laying on of Hands. The efficacy of the Rite, and the intention of the Rite, is the bestowal of the Holy Ghost. Is it not then a mere war of words to contend that they are not identical? But there shall be no question about the identity of the two ordinances. A perusal of sections 3 and 4 of the treatise shows conclusively that what was intended by the Imposition of Hands in the reconciliation of heretics was the bestowal of the gift which the Apostles Peter and John gave to the Samaritans.

In Sec. 3 the writer argues that those elements of regeneration, water and the Spirit, which ordinarily are associated in the New Testament, may be sometimes found "in some sort divided,"—his aim being to show, that although heretics have not the Spirit, their Baptism should not be repeated when they return to the Church, the spiritual defect of

the heretic being supplied by Confirmation. He quotes the case of the Samaritans who when baptized did not receive the Spirit, which afterwards was conferred upon them by Imposition of the Hands of the Apostles. Then he discusses in section 4 the case of those who have been baptized but "depart from this life without Imposition of the Bishop's Hands." He says there is no doubt in the Church regarding the salvation of such persons, although not confirmed they are "esteemed perfect believers." And he continues, "But if thou admittest this, and believest it to be saving, and dost not gainsay the opinion of all the faithful, thou must needs confess this, that even as this principle proceeds more largely to be discussed, that other also can be more broadly established; that is, that by Imposition of Hands alone, of the Bishop,—because baptism in the Name of Jesus Christ has gone before it—may the Holy Spirit also be given to another man who repents and believes."

Bearing in mind the point which the writer has under discussion, whether heretics should be rebaptized, or that according to "ancient custom hands only should be laid on them for their reception of the Holy Spirit," it is plain from the above quotation that he identifies this Rite with the Con-

firmation administered by the Apostles to the Samaritans. He argues that the Spirit may sometimes be bestowed in Baptism, and sometimes in the Laying on of Hands. He says we do not deny the salvation of those baptized persons who die unconfirmed; and that the converse of this is true; that although a person has not received the Spirit when he was baptized among heretics, yet on his reception into the Church the spiritual defect may be fully remedied by the Laying on of Hands. By this means the Holy Ghost will be given to them. His proof that the Holy Ghost is thus given is the case of the Samaritans who had been baptized, but had not received the Spirit. The Spirit was bestowed on them by the Imposition of the Hands of the Apostles. Evidently this writer, who so ably represented the position of the Roman party, had never heard that there was any difference between Confirmation and the Laying on of Hands by which heretics were reconciled to the Church; for what an easy refutation of his whole elaborate argument would it have been, if anyone could have urged that the Laying on of Hands which the Samaritans received and that which was bestowed on heretics were not considered identical. Nothing in the treatise is written to anticipate any such objection, and in all the

letters of Cyprian it is never urged, for the good and sufficient reason that such a distinction was never heard of in the Church until more than three centuries later, when it first appeared in the so-called letter of Vigilius of Rome.

When we turn to the letters of Cyprian, we find that he also identifies the Laying on of Hands by which heretics were reconciled to the Church, with the Confirmation which the Apostles administered to the Samaritans. In his letter to Stephen (Epistle 71, Migne's numbering) he says: "Those who have been dipped abroad outside the Church, and have been stained among heretics and schismatics with the taint of profane water, when they come to us, and to the Church, which is one, ought to be baptized, for the reason that it is a small matter to lay hands on them that they may receive the Holy Ghost (he here quotes Acts VIII. 17), unless they receive also the Baptism of the Church. For then finally can they be fully sanctified and be the sons of God if they be born of *each Sacrament*." Here Cyprian identifies the Laying on of Hands by which Stephen's party according to the ancient custom of the Church admitted heretics to Communion, with the Confirmation which the Apostles bestowed on the Samaritans, but says it is not enough, the heretic must be born of each Sacra-

ment, he must be baptized as well as confirmed. In his letter to Jubaianus (Epistle 72) Sec. 6, he says: "But if, according to a perverted faith, one could be baptized without, and obtain remission of sins, according to the same faith he could also attain the Holy Spirit; and there is no need that hands should be laid on him when he comes that he might obtain the Holy Spirit and be sealed. Either he could obtain both privileges without by his faith, or he who has been without has received neither." Nothing could be plainer than this. Cyprian argues that if the heretical Baptism is valid, then the Confirmation administered by the heretical Bishop is valid too, and there is no need that heretics should be confirmed when they are received into the Church. But assume that the Laying on of Hands which heretics received when reconciled to the Church, is not Confirmation, and what becomes of the argument? It would have no force whatever. In Sec 9 he says: "In respect of the assertion of some concerning those who had been baptized in Samaria, that when the Apostles Peter and John came, only hands were imposed on them that they might receive the Holy Ghost, yet that they were not re-baptized; we see that that place does not touch the present case. For they who had believed in

Samaria had believed with a true faith; and within, in the Church which is one, and to which alone it is granted to bestow the grace of Baptism and to remit sins, had been baptized by Philip the deacon, whom the same Apostles had sent. And therefore, because they had obtained a legitimate and ecclesiastical baptism, there was no need that they should be baptized any more, but only that which was needed was performed by Peter and John; viz., that prayer being made for them, and hands being imposed, the Holy Spirit should be invoked and poured out upon them, which now too is done among us, so that they who are baptized in the Church are brought to the prelates of the Church, and by our prayers and by the Imposition of Hands obtain the Holy Spirit, and are perfected with the Lord's Seal."

Now when the opponents of Cyprian cited the Confirmation of the Samaritans as a justification of their custom of receiving heretics by the Imposition of Hands, why did he not retort that the two ceremonies were different things, that it was Confirmation which the Apostles administered, whereas everybody knew that the ceremony by which heretics were reconciled to the Church was not Confirmation. We see he does not make this objection, but allows that the two Rites are identical,

for the good and sufficient reason that no man in the Catholic Church in that day knew of any distinction between them. Both the African prelate and the great faction opposed to him looked on this Laying on of Hands which was bestowed on penitent heretics as identical with the Rite which was administered to the Samaritans by the Apostles. From that day onward the testimony of the Church is consistent. In the Western Church heretics are reconciled by the Laying on of Hands, and in the Eastern Church by the Anointing with the Holy Chrism.

Here let me remark that it is impossible to say when the custom of anointing the forehead with the Chrism became part of the Confirmation Rite. Originally the anointing was part of the ceremony of Baptism. There was an anointing of the candidate before Baptism, and an anointing after the administration of that Sacrament. In the Roman Office of Baptism we find traces of those ancient ceremonies. The infant before it is baptized, is anointed on the breast and between the shoulders with the "*Oleum Catechumenorum*," and after Baptism it is anointed again with the Chrism "*in summitate capitis in modum crucis*" (vid. Roman Pontifical). This anointing seems in the days of Cyprian to have had a very subor-

dinate place. I think he mentions it only once. (Epistle 69). He says nothing about it in connection with Confirmation in his description of Confirmation which I have quoted from Epistle 72. Epistle 75, Sec. 11 may serve also as an illustration. "Those who patronize heretics and schismatics must answer us whether they have or have not the Holy Ghost. If they have, why are hands imposed on those who are baptized among them when they come to us, that they may receive the Holy Ghost, since He must surely have been received there, where if He was, He could be given? But if heretics and schismatics baptized without, have not the Holy Spirit, and therefore hands are imposed on them among us, that *here* may be received what *there* neither is, nor can be given; it is plain, also, that remission of sins cannot be given by those who, it is certain, have not the Holy Spirit. And therefore * * * they must all absolutely be baptized with the Baptism of the Church who come from adversaries and antichrists to the Church of Christ." This passage bears witness to several facts. It not only clearly shows that the Laying on of Hands which the heretics received was Confirmation, but that these heretics had the same facilities for receiving heretical Confirmation that they had for receiving heretical Baptism. His

argument is, if you do not baptize these heretics again, why confirm them, that they may receive the Holy Ghost? "Since He surely must have been received there, where if He was, He could be given." The Novatian heresy then was agitating the Church. Theodoret some two centuries later says: "The Novatians did not confer the holy Chrism on those whom they baptized." And Scudamore in the article "Unction" (Smith's Dictionary of Christian Antiquities) infers from this that the sect did not confer Confirmation. But in the days of Cyprian there is nothing to show that the Chrism formed any part of the Confirmation Rite, and the above passage bears witness that these Novatian heretics were confirmed, but that the Church treated the Confirmation as null and void. Nothing is said of the Chrism in this passage. The means by which the gift of the Spirit is conveyed is the Imposition of Hands. Ages passed after the death of Cyprian before Unction became a distinctive feature of the Confirmation Rite in the Western Church. Ambrose in his work "*De Mysteriis*," speaks of the Unction as a part of the "Laver," and after he has left the Font goes on to speak of the "seal" and "perfecting," the expressions Cyprian in the preceding century had used of the Imposition of Hands by which the

seven-fold Spirit was conveyed. Optatus (De Schism, Don. IV.) says that the water does not convey the gift, and the oil does not convey it. It makes the new cleansed soul ready to receive the Spirit so that He may be invoked to take up His abode in it through the Laying on of Hands. It is a far cry from the position of a Churchman in the age of Optatus, to that occupied by the Roman Pontifical. "Confirmo te Chrismate Salutis." St. Augustine writing about a century and a half later than Cyprian, indicates that Unction was growing in importance, but he associates it so closely with Baptism that the validity of the one Rite implies the validity of the other, so that if the one is not to be repeated, neither need the other be repeated, and he nowhere speaks of it as part of the Confirmation Rite.

Speaking of the sins of men offering no bar to the grace of the Sacraments they administer, he exclaims: "How is it that God hears the invocation of a murderer either over the Water of Baptism, or over the Oil, or over the Eucharist, or over the heads of those who receive Imposition of the Hand?" Here the Oil and the Baptism are closely connected, while Confirmation is so distinct from Unction in the mind of the writer that he mentions the Eucharist between them. He refers beyond

question to the Unction with the Chrism which took place immediately after the act of Baptism, and as I have shown above, holds that position in the Roman Office of Baptism now. The first clear proof of the Chrism being used by the Bishops at Confirmation in the Western Church, as distinct from the Baptismal Unction is said to be found in an Epistle of Innocent, of Rome, A.D. 416. (Fleury Hist. Eccl. Bk. XXIII. Cap. 32.)

“Les prêtres peuvent bien faire aux baptises l’onction du chrême, pourvu qu’il soit consacré par l’évêque; mais ils n’en peuvent pas marquer le front, cela n’est permis qu’aux évêques, quand ils donnent le S. Esprit.” I have not the original before me, and so I give the statement of this accurate historian. It hardly bears out the general assertion that the application of the Chrism dates from this period. Whether the Chrism was used in making the sign of the cross on the forehead the extract does not say. At all events the innovation did not at once become popular in the Western Church. The first Council of Orange, A. D. 441, ordered that Chrism should *not* be administered at Confirmation, unless from some necessary cause it had been omitted at Baptism. (First Council Orange Can. II.) The second Council of Arles, A.D. 452, also adopted this decree, and even

as far on as the time of Aleuin, writers in describing Confirmation often mention only the Laying on of Hands and say nothing about Unction.

Thus, Aleuin says, "Novissime per impositionem manus a summo sacerdote septiformis gratiae Spiritum accepit."

This fact must be borne in mind. The Chrism only became a part of the Confirmation Rite in the Western Churches at a comparatively late date. As I have shown it was looked upon as a part of Baptism for generations after Cyprian's day; and when the innovation was introduced some time in the 5th century, it was frequently resisted, and actually forbidden by the decrees of provincial councils. We therefore are not to think, that in any of the directions regarding the re-confirmation of heretics, anything was wanting to the completeness of the Rite, because it is not ordered that they should receive the Chrism as well as the Laying on of Hands. As soon as the Chrism became a part of the Rite of Confirmation, heretics returning to the Communion of the Church received it, as well as Imposition of Hands. I think I have shown, beyond question, that in Cyprian's day there was no distinction whatever between an ordinary Confirmation and the Laying on of Hands by which heretics were reconciled to the Church.

The Rite was administered for the same purpose in either case: to bestow the seven-fold gift of the Spirit. It was held that heretics did not have the Spirit, and therefore could not give the Spirit. Their Confirmation, therefore, was null and void, and must be repeated. We know Cyprian contended it was not enough to re-confirm the heretic, he insisted, also, on re-baptism. But the mind of the Church was that Cyprian was in error. The ancient custom, against which he so vigorously protested, remained the rule, that the heretic should be reconciled to the Church by Confirmation. Before turning from the clear testimony of this writer, which seems to me to show conclusively that the re-confirmation of the heretic is the ancient custom and rule of the Catholic Church, I will quote from his letter to Firmilian (Epistle 74). In section 8 he cites the case of those disciples at Ephesus to whom St. Paul ordered Christian Baptism to be administered and then confirmed them, and he goes on to say: "But what kind of a thing is it, that when we see that Paul after John's baptism, baptized his disciples again, we are hesitating to baptize those who come to the Church from heresy after their unhalloved and profane dipping. Unless, perchance, Paul was inferior to the Bishops of these times, so

that these indeed can by Imposition of Hands alone give the Holy Spirit to those heretics who come (to the Church), while Paul was not fitted to give the Holy Spirit by Imposition of Hands to those who had been baptized by John, unless he had first baptized them also with the baptism of the Church." I think there is no possibility of avoiding the conclusion, that if it was Confirmation St. Paul gave to the men of Ephesus, then it was by Confirmation that heretics were received by the Church in the days of Cyprian.

Neither he nor his adversaries ever dreamed of the easy refutation of each other's arguments which would have resulted from the simple denial of the identity of the two ceremonies. That was reserved for a later generation which had been misled by a Roman novelty, and tempted to forget a Catholic principle. It will suffice to show that the ancient custom of re-confirming heretics obtained in the Church for fully two hundred years after Cyprian's contest with Stephen, as the unquestioned rule. At the Council of Arles held some sixty years after Cyprian's death, it was decreed (Canon 8) that when heretics who had been baptized in the Name of the Trinity returned to the Church they should be reconciled by Imposition of Hands, that they might receive the Holy Spirit.

Siricius, Bishop of Rome A.D. 384, in his letter to Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona, orders that converts from Arianism should not be re-baptized, but attached to the Catholic Communion by means of the invocation of the seven-fold Spirit only, by Imposition of the Bishop's Hand. "Per invocationem solam septiformis Spiritus episcopalis manus impositione." Fleury's comment is, "C'est-a-dire qu'on leur donnera la confirmation." Canon Mason says: "It is but a dispute about words when it is debated whether such an act is, or is not Confirmation. *The seven-fold Spirit is the Confirmation Gift.*"

Pope Innocent writing to Alexander, of Antioch, A.D. 415, says that the Arians are to be received into the Church by Imposition of Hands *to give them the Holy Spirit* (Fleury Bk. 23. Cap. 26). His reason is the same that was urged in Cyprian's age. Heretics could not confer grace. St. Augustine, A.D., 354-430, in his writings against the Donatists asserts in many places that heretics whose Baptism is valid are to be reconciled to the Church by the Laying on of Hands that they may receive the Holy Spirit. In Bk. III. Cap. 16, he declares that the Spirit cannot be received outside the Catholic Church; he cites the case of Simon Magus, who had the Sacra-

ment without the operation of the Spirit, and concludes that whatever may be received by the heretics and schismatics they cannot have the gift of charity. "At any rate outside the bond (of the Church) that love cannot exist, without which, all other requisites, even if they can be recognized and approved, cannot profit, or release from sin. But the Laying on of Hands is not like Baptism incapable of repetition." In Bk. V. Cap. 23 he says that heretics have not the Church and have not the Holy Spirit, but they have Baptism, and he insists that they shall be received by the Laying on of Hands. In these letters we must remember that Augustine is continually commenting on the writings of Cyprian. Nowhere does he hint that the ancient custom of the Church had changed, or that the Laying on of Hands by which heretics were received in Cyprian's age, and which that prelate considered identical with the Rite ministered by Peter and John at Samaria and by Paul at Ephesus, had acquired a new significance. The Laying on of Hands is still given, to confer the Holy Spirit, for outside the Church the Spirit is not, and so the heretical Confirmation is void.

Jerome, A. D. 340-420, is our next witness. This eminent writer, in his dialogue with the Luciferian, had a full opportunity to deny that

there was any identity between the Rite practised by Luciferians in receiving heretics, and the Rite practised by Catholic Bishops in completion of Baptisms bestowed by Catholic presbyters. But he does nothing of the kind. He evidently knows of no distinction between the penitential and the confirmatory Laying on of Hands. The passage is too long to be quoted in full. (Vid. sections 6-10).

The Luciferians, let us remember, were extreme Churchmen, who, while accepting as valid the Baptism conferred by Arian Bishops, refused to acknowledge the Bishops who had repented of Arian opinions. The object of the dialogue is to show their inconsistency. We are not to imagine that Jerome himself advocated the re-baptism of Arians, but he strives to prove that the Luciferian is bound to reject the Baptism if he will not admit the penitent Bishop. The Luciferian says, "When I receive a lay penitent (from the Arians), it is with Laying on of Hands, and invocation of the Holy Spirit, for I know that the Holy Spirit cannot be given by heretics." Jerome (Orthodoxus) insists that the Arians must also be re-baptized. The Luciferian cites the case of the men of Ephesus who had been baptized, and yet knew not that there was any Holy Ghost, to show that a person

might be baptized and yet not possess the Spirit. Jerome answers that the baptism of John was not Christian Baptism, and that these persons were baptized again before St. Paul would confirm them, and adds, "Do you follow the Apostles, and baptize those who have not had Christian Baptism, and you will be able to invoke the Holy Ghost." The Luciferian retorts, Sec. 8, "Don't you know that the Laying on of Hands after Baptism, and then the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is a custom of the Churches? Do you demand Scripture proof? You may find it in the Acts of the Apostles. So you see we follow the practice of the Churches, although it may be clear that a person was baptized before the Spirit was invoked." Jerome rejoins: "I do not deny that it is the practice of the Church in the case of those baptized by presbyters and deacons for the Bishop to visit them, and by the Laying on of Hands to invoke the Holy Ghost upon them. But how shall I describe your habit of applying the laws of the Church to heretics? If a Bishop lays his hands on men, he lays them on those who have been baptized in the right faith, but an Arian has no faith * * * how then can he receive the Holy Ghost who has not yet obtained remission of sins?"

We see that in this dialogue both Jerome and

his opponent allow that the Laying on of Hands, by which the Luciferian says he reconciles heretics, is the same Rite as that by which the Bishops complete the Baptisms performed by the presbyters of the Church, and for which authority is to be found in the Acts of the Apostles.

Neither of them demurs in the slightest degree to this complete identification of the penitential Laying on of Hands with Confirmation. Farther on in Section 9, Jerome quotes the Confirmation at Samaria: "Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost," and he adds, "and if *you here say that you do the same*, because the heretics have not baptized into the Holy Ghost, I must remind you that Philip was not separated from the Church." Why did not Jerome tell his opponent that the Confirmation given to the Samaritans and the Laying on of Hands by which heretics were reconciled were not the same? The reason is that he lived too early to be able to do so. The fraudulent so-called letter of Vigilius in which for the first time the penitential Laying on of Hands is declared to be a different thing from Confirmation, was not written until more than a century had elapsed after Jerome had fallen asleep. No testimony surely can be more conclusive than the voice of this eminent theologian and doctor of the Church.

I close my illustrations of the custom of the Western Church by quoting the decrees of the provincial Councils of Orange, Arles and Epone.

The 1st Council of Orange, Canon I., says that heretics at the point of death, desiring to be received into the Church, if the Bishop is absent, shall be reconciled by presbyters, with the Chrism and the Laying on of Hands. The second Council of Arles orders certain heretics, who have been baptized in the Name of the Trinity, to be received into the Church with the Chrism and the Laying on of Hands. The Council of Epone, Canon XVI., makes the same provision that I have quoted above from the decrees of Orange, adding that heretics in health must go to the Bishop. Here we note that the re-Confirmation of heretics and schismatics was considered more necessary than the Confirmation of those who had been baptized in the Church. For, as Jerome remarks in his dialogue with the Luciferian (Sec. 9), many who were baptized in the Church died before the Bishop could give them Confirmation, yet no rule was made allowing presbyters to confirm such persons in time of extremity. The reason was that the baptized in the Church had received the grace of the Holy Spirit in Baptism, and there was not the same absolute necessity for their Confirmation

as existed in the case of heretics. For heretics had not the Spirit, and could not confer grace, either in the Baptism or in the Confirmation administered by them. The first Council of Orange was held A.D. 441; the second Council of Arles, A.D. 452; the Council of Epone, A.D. 517.

The Chrism having become part of the Confirmation Rite, in the 5th century, in the Western Church, we note that it forms part of the ceremony by which heretics are admitted to the Communion. So far I have dealt with the ancient custom of the Western Church.

In the Eastern Church the Confirmation Rite was corrupted at an early day, so that the Laying on of Hands, practically, was completely obscured. Cyril, A.D. 318-380, in his catechetical lectures, has nothing to say about the Imposition of Hands. He mentions the Mysteries in this order: Baptism, the Chrism and the First Communion. In lecture 21, "On Chrism," he describes the Eastern mode of Confirmation. The ointment is applied to the forehead, ears, nostrils and breast, implying that the soul is sanctified by the holy and life-giving Spirit. When the innovation began we cannot say, but anointing with the Chrism had become in Cyril's day the expression in the Eastern Church for Confirmation or the Laying on of Hands. But

the custom was the same as in the West in regard to the reconciliation of heretics. They were confirmed when they returned to the Church.

The second General Council of the Catholic Church, held in Constantinople A.D. 381, directs (Canon VII.) that heretics validly baptized are to be reconciled to the Church with the precise ritual acts and words of Confirmation. They are to be anointed with the Chrism on the forehead, eyes, nostrils, mouth and ears, the officiant saying, "The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit." This is the Eastern mode of administering Confirmation, even to-day. Bright, in his notes, objects to the form of this Canon, and insists that it is part of a letter, describing the custom of the Church at Constantinople. But I am not concerned with the question of its binding authority on the whole Church, I quote it because of its conclusive testimony as to the ancient tradition in the Eastern Church concerning the reconciliation of heretics. Like every other voice of antiquity, it declares that they are to be confirmed. The Council of Laodicea (Canon VII.) declares that those heretics whose Baptism is formally complete are to renounce their former heresies, to learn the Catholic Creed, and to be anointed with the holy Chrism, and then admitted to the Holy Communion. St. Basil directs

that the members of certain heretical sects, on repentance, are to be anointed by the faithful, and so approach the holy mysteries. Justin Martyr (Pseudo) in his questions and responses, says to the question why the Baptism of a penitent heretic is allowed: "When a heretic comes over to the Catholic faith, the fault of his heterodoxy is corrected by the change of his opinion, and the faultiness of his baptism by the Unction of the Holy Chrism." Finally, the Quinisext Council, or Council in Trullo, re-affirmed the decree of the second Council, A.D. 381, only adding the Paulini to the list of those heretics whose defective baptism must be repeated.

Farther testimony concerning the rule and custom of the Eastern Church seems unnecessary, for these voices are authoritative and final. The heretic was to be reconciled with the ritual acts and words of Eastern Confirmation. We have now traced the custom of the Catholic Church from the age of Cyprian A.D. 250, to the sixth century. I cannot find that anywhere there is any difference mentioned between Confirmation and the Rite by which heretics were reconciled to the Church. The ritual of Confirmation varied according to time and place, and the ceremony by which heretics were admitted into the Church varied with it.

Thus in the Western Church A.D. 250, Cyprian describes Confirmation thus (Epistle 72, Sec. 9): "They who are baptized in the Church are brought to the prelates of the Church, and by our prayers and by the Imposition of Hands obtain the Holy Spirit, and are perfected with the Lord's Seal." As that was the mode of Confirmation at that time, heretics were reconciled by Imposition of Hands.

In the 5th century in the Western Church, the anointing with the Chrism had become part of the Confirmation Rite, and so we find Councils ordering that heretics are to be received with the Chrism and Laying on of Hands. In the Eastern Church, anointing with the Chrism had become the confirming act, and heretics are to be reconciled there by anointing them with the Chrism, and repeating over them the Eastern confirming sentence, "The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit." Over and over again the great men of the past compare this ritual act by which heretics were reconciled with the two cases of Confirmation mentioned in the Acts of the Holy Apostles, as if there was no distinction between them. I can come to only one conclusion. It is the rule of the Catholic Church that the heretic should be re-confirmed when he is received into the Church. I know that there is a

widespread opinion that the penitential Laying on of Hands by which the heretic was reconciled was not a Confirmation. But I think it is opposed to the plain testimony of antiquity, and it seems to me that it had not a very respectable origin.

Canon Mason, in his work on the relation of Baptism to Confirmation, says, p. 180, "The earliest attempt to distinguish between the Confirmatory and the penitential Laying on of Hands—if the document is genuine—occurs in an epistle purporting to be by Vigilius, Bishop of Rome, A. D. 538," which says of men who had received Arian Baptism, "But their reconciliation does not take effect (*operatur*—perhaps in late Latin, 'is not effected') by means of that imposition of the hand which takes place through (*per*) invocation of the Holy Ghost, but by means of that imposition whereby the fruit of penitence is acquired, and the restoration of the Holy Communion is performed." But there is grave reason to discredit the document. It exists in more than one form, and has certainly been largely interpolated in the interests of the Roman See. It is alleged to be the same letter which was read aloud at the first Council of Braga (A.D. 561), addressed by the See of Rome to Profuturus, formerly Bishop of Braga. But, on the one hand, there is nothing to prove that the

letter read there was written by Vigilius, or that Profuturus was contemporary with him; and, on the other hand, several ancient copies of our letter appear to be addressed "ad Eutherium," without mention of his see. The contents of the epistle as we have it do not tally with what appear to have been the contents of the letter read at Braga. And finally, the epistle seems not to have been known to Isidore of Seville, which could hardly have been the case had it been the letter read at Braga. Part of the letter may be genuine, but the sentence quoted bears every sign of being modern.

The criticism of this learned and cautious writer needs no comment. The first attempt to deny that the ceremony by which heretics were received into the Church was Confirmation, seems to have been a forgery, and an exceedingly clumsy one, too. For all the statements concerning the reconciliation of heretics expressly say that Laying on of Hands as in the Western Church, or the Chrism as in the Eastern Church, is bestowed on the heretic that the Holy Spirit may be invoked and poured out on him. The treatise on the re-Baptism of heretics which represented the views of Stephen, the opponent of Cyprian, says that "the most ancient custom and tradition of the Church is that only hands should be laid on them by the

Bishop for their reception of the Holy Ghost." Cyprian (Letter 75) says, "Heretics and schismatics have not the Holy Spirit, and therefore hands are imposed on them among us, that here may be received what there neither is, nor can be given." The Council of Arles commands that heretics who have been baptized in the Name of the Trinity, when they return to the Church, be reconciled by Imposition of Hands, that they may receive the Holy Spirit. Siricius, Bishop of Rome, commands that Arians returning to the Church, be attached to the Catholic Communion "Per invocationem solam septiformis Spiritus episcopalis manus impositione." Pope Innocent declares that Arians are to be received into the Church by the Imposition of Hands to *give them the Holy Spirit*. St. Augustine declares that the Holy Spirit cannot be received outside the Catholic Church, and therefore the heretic must receive the Laying on of Hands. Jerome says that the penitent heretic is to be received by Laying on of Hands and invocation of the Holy Spirit, for the Holy Spirit cannot be given by heretics. Leo, Bishop of Rome, Epistle 159, says, "Those who received Baptism from heretics are to be confirmed by invocation of the Holy Ghost only, through the Imposition of Hands (*sola invocatione Spiritus*

Sancti per impositionem manuum confirmandi sunt), because they have but the form of Baptism without its sanctifying power. The Eastern Church decrees that the heretic is to receive the Chrism with the words, "The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit."

But this so-called letter of Vigilinus, which Canon Mason thinks "bears every sign" of being a forgery, informs us "Their reconciliation does not take effect by means of that Imposition of the Hand which takes place through invocation of the Holy Ghost." Whom, then, shall we follow? Shall we hear the Church during the first six centuries, or shall we listen to this tainted witness that comes forth some time in the sixth or seventh century, from that source which you well denounce "the mother of schisms and the mistress of heresy," and flatly contradicts the unanimous voice of the Early Church, and endeavors to teach us a new way? The choice, surely, is not difficult to make. It seems to me that we will be following the ancient custom of the Church if we insist that the Roman heretic, whether clerical or lay, who desires admission to our Communion shall be reconciled to the Church by Confirmation.

In your Pastoral Letter you remark that "If any one needs purging and reconciling from the

sins of heresy and schism it is the Roman Catholic returning to Catholicity." In saying this, I believe you are accurately expressing the mind of the American Church. It has been said that Rome excommunicated England, and not England Rome. And English writers, when commenting on Roman errors, often speak as if the English Church could not exactly decide how far Rome had gone on the way to heresy. The errors were very dangerous. Rome had gone very far in the way of evil; but still, such was the excessive charity of the Anglican Church, it could not say plainly that the Roman Church was in heresy. And it is supposed by many of us, that while the mind of the English Church is still in this state of hesitating indecision, the American Church waits for the voice of the mother with filial respect, before pronouncing any final opinion regarding Roman heresy. But such statements are misleading. If a man's hands are tied behind his back, there is some other reason besides a sentimental weakness for a sinner which prevents him from chastising him; or if the tongue of a witness is cut out, it would be a shame to accuse him of unwillingness to bear testimony for the truth, when really he is unable to do so. And how, indeed, is the Church of England to denounce any heresy,

whether it originates in Rome, or elsewhere, when for 335 years it has, by the laws imposed on it, been expressly forbidden to do so? Here is the law of the Church of England:

April 29, 1559, an act was passed "for restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State, Ecclesiastical and Spiritual, and abolishing all foreign powers repugnant to the same." This Supremacy Act empowers the Queen to appoint visitors to "visit, reform, redress, order, correct and amend all such errors, *heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities*, which by any manner, spiritual or ecclesiastical, power, authority or jurisdiction can, or may be, lawfully reformed, ordered, redeemed, corrected or amended." In the act there is this important proviso: No person appointed by the Crown to execute spiritual jurisdiction *shall have power to determine any matter to be heresy*, except what has been adjudged to be heresy by the canonical Scriptures, or by any of the first four General Councils, or any other General Council, or "shall be ordered, judged or determined to be heresy by the high court of Parliament of the realm, with the assent of the clergy in their convocations, anything in the Act to the contrary notwithstanding." That is the restraint which silences the voice of the Church

of England with regard to heresy. It would, indeed, be a note of contempt against that venerable Apostolic Communion if one could truthfully say that it had lost the power to distinguish between truth and error, or that God, having set it in its place to bear witness to the truth, and plainly to rebuke sin, it had refused to do so because of a sentimental weakness for the sinner, which it was bound to judge and condemn. But this is not the truth. The Church of England does not speak because its voice is stifled, and it cannot speak.

For, of course, when the English parliament was constituted the authority, which must first determine any matter to be heresy, before Convocation could even assent to the conclusion, the whole subject was consigned to a ridiculous and impossible court. It does not make the matter any better to say that the Church and the nation of England were supposed to be conterminatè, the English parliament from its very nature was never competent to decide on any article of faith.

But while the English Church has been compelled to keep silence, the American Church has spoken. It has not, indeed, formally denounced any Roman heresy, by name, but it has deliberately assumed that the Roman Catholic Church is no longer in communion with the Church

Catholic. In Canon XV., Title I., the American Church, through its House of Bishops and its House of Deputies, takes this position. The Canon is designated, "Of the Admission of Ministers ordained by Bishops not in Communion with this Church." This designation applies to Bishops of the Roman Communion; and where the Bishop is, there is the Church. It is not in Communion with this Church. That is the deliberate conclusion of the American Church. It can mean only one thing, that the Roman Church is in heresy. For this Church did not intend to unchurch itself by that declaration. It believes that it is in the Communion of the Catholic Church, and it could not use that expression of any portion of the Catholic Church, however remote. For example we can imagine some colored convert of the Universities' Mission in the heart of Africa, becoming a Bishop of the Church in the Dark Continent, but although he may never have seen an American Churchman, may never have had any opportunity of ministering at our Altars, or of communing with us, yet we believe such a person has full Communion with us, and we would accept the Orders given by him to a priest, as readily as if the ordination had been performed by the Metropolitan of Canterbury. He would not be des-

ignated "a Bishop not in Communion with this Church." Nor would we use such an expression of one of the faithful dead. We would not say, of St. Paul, or St. Jerome, that in their places, among the spirits of just men made perfect, they are not in Communion with this Church. For the Communion of Saints is part of our Creed.

No matter how remote in time, or in the circumstances of geographical position any portion of the Catholic Church may be, yet the Church is one, and as part of the Catholic Church we have Communion with it. But the American Church in Convention, deliberately places the fact on record that the Roman Catholic is not in Communion with this Church. What is this, but to say that the Romanist is in heresy?

What is needed, is that the American Bishops should specify and condemn those heresies which Rome holds and teaches. They have been called to their high position that they might bear witness to the truth and warn men against error.

The ignorant, the foolish, and the disloyal, who are to be found in every great army, need to be told that the Church has condemned as heresies the dangerous errors of Rome, and that the man who holds them, much more the minister who teaches them, puts himself outside the Communion of the Catholic Church.

We may be told that we must not act precipitately, but must wait for concerted action on the part of the Anglican Church. But I do not read history in that way. The great Churchmen of the past did not wait until they had a vast gathering behind them, before they ventured to bear witness to the truth, and to condemn heresy. The heresy of Arius was branded by one brave Bishop long before it came before a general council, and if he had not taken action, the council would probably never have spoken at all. So it was with all the ancient heresies. The watchmen of the Church, bravely spoke the truth concerning them as soon as they appeared, and it was the appeal from their condemnation that was determined by the great Councils of the Church. It is time for our Bishops to supplement the statement of our Church that Rome is outside the Communion of this Church. What is their decision concerning the Tridentine decrees? What is their mind with regard to the Immaculate Conception, and the Papal Infallibility? Rome tells men they must believe these things and if anyone will not do so, let him be Anathema. Is this teaching true, or is Rome a false witness, on whom has been sent a strong delusion that she should believe a lie?

We wait for our Bishops to speak, and mean-

while let every priest, on whom the Church has placed the responsibility of determining what persons are fit to be confirmed, see that all converts from Rome are reconciled to the Church by the ancient Catholic custom of Confirmation.

Very respectfully,

J. D. MORRISON.

St. John's Rectory, Ogdensburg,

September 13th, 1894.

[THE END.]

